Judgment fixed

UPON THE

Accuſer of our Brethren,

AND THE

Real Chriſtian-Quaker

VINDICATED

From the Perſecuting OUTRAGE of

Apoſtate Informers;

Chiefly from *W. Rogers*, *F. Bugg*, *T. Criſp*, *John Pennyman* and *Jeffery Bullock*, their Malicious, Confuſed and Unjuſt Oppoſition and Imputation of *Apoſtacy*, *Impoſition*, *Popery*, &c. in their abuſive Books and Pamphlets herein ſpecified.

Beginning with *W. R*'s Seventh Part.

By that Contemned Servant of Chriſt,
George Whitehead.

Pſal. 109. 3. *They compaſſed me about with words of Hatred, &c.* verſ. 4. *For my Love they are my Adverſaries, but I give my ſelf unto Prayer.*
Jude v. 13. *Raging Waves of the Sea, foaming out their own Shame, &c.*

London, Printed and Sold by *Andrew Sowle* at the Crooked-Billet in *Holloway-Lane*, near *Shoreditch*, 1682.

An Introductory Epiſtle.

To my beloved and tender-hearted Friends, called *Quakers*, who are lovers of Peace and Unity in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; Greeting in the holy Spirit of Life.

IF I did not feel the Lord my God laying a real neceſſity upon me to be publickly concerned in this Controverſie (and that for the ſake of ſimple Hearts and poor Lambs, to warn them againſt ſuch grievous Wolves as ſeek to prey upon them, rend and tear them; and that the weak of the Flock may not be hurt, ſcattered or perverted by thoſe that ſpeak perverſe things, to draw Diſciples after them) I would chuſe rather to ſit down mute, and ſilently bear the Revilings, Outrage and fierce Deſpiſings of crooked Spirits, than ſpend time in Controverſie with them or againſt them. But the Lord has laied the neceſſity, and knows beſt my Conſcientious concern, and for what end, and to what effect, and for whoſe ſakes. And in diſcharging my Duty, I neither conſult Events, nor fear Effects, but leave all to God; for I feel his divine Power and Counſel; In whoſe Name, and in the Patience, Forbearance, Long-ſuffering and Bowels of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, my Soul hath had a ſhare in deep

Travail and Exercise (with many more of his faithful Servants, my Brethren) for a quiet Composure of this Breach; 1st, *With Respect to* Truth's Reputation: 2dly, *With respect to that* Compassion *that's to be had on some, where a difference ought to be made for the regaining and delivering them who have been at unawares tak'n captive by the Enemy. I have no self-Interest nor end, but the Churches Peace and the Salvation of Souls, and Prosperity of the Lord's Work in the Earth. God doth bear me Record, I have not been awanting in Christian Endeavours, private and friendly, with divers principally concerned in this* Opposite, Rending, Self-Separating Spirit. *Christian Patience and Forbearance have not been awanting in the Exercise of my Spirit and Testimony. But when all our Christian Endeavours on these accounts have been rejected by some* Conceited, Exalted, Pufft up Luciferian Spirits, Despisers *and* Mockers, *that have of late time lusted to be Contentious, and at open War and Defiance against many of the faithful* Ministers *and* Servants of our Lord Jesus Christ, *who have kept their Garments and Stations in* Truth *and* Uprightness, *and whom they have most grosly abused in Print in their Books and Pamphlets: On this extream Occasion and Offence given against the Truth and Gods Heritage, I find my Spirit stirred and moved within me by and in the same Long-suffering tender Spirit and Power of Christ Jesus my Lord, (saying,*

Why

Why should God's Heritage lie under their publick Lyes and Defamations, without open Rebuke?) *and to withstand, oppose, weaken and repel these their Wicked Attempts and Insolent Abuses, and to vindicate the peaceable Christian People called* Quakers, *in their blessed* Society, Order *and* Church-Discipline, &c. *from the cruel Envy, Scorn, Outrage, Madness and Confusions of certain Persons turned* Apostate Informers, Treacherous Hypocrites, False Brethren, *and* Deceitful Workers, Betraying Judases, Devils Incarnate *(for Christ called Judas a Devil) who having lost their First Love to Truth, and gone out from us, are become* Degenerate, without Natural Affection, Dogs that are without, Wolves, and Raging Waves of the Sea, that foam out their own Shame; *whom the strength of Truth is turned against in Judgment, and* God in ten Thousand of his Saints is coming to execute * Judgment upon them; *as the Patience of Christ in his Saints comes to be fulfilled towards them, and their Iniquity ripened for open Discovery and Condemnation, as they have not spared publickly to defame the Innocent.* [*But they that are at unawares betrayed, deceived or only mistaken, (and not wilful & contentious) are to be had Compassion of, and distinguished from the other.*] *And in Righteous Judgment will the great Judge of all decide the Controversie with all them who would be counted true* Jews *and are not,* Christian-Quakers,

* Jude 13, 14. vers.

Quakers, *and are not, but of the Synagogue of* Satan *and* Antichrist; *whose Works the Day of Christ our Lord will yet more clearly declare and fully manifest, and the Day and Time hastens, blessed are they that watch, and keep their Garments, that their Nakedness appear not,* Amen.

Ingenuous Reader, *Note, that the Contents of the ensuing Treatise are mostly placed before each Chapter, respectively in several Sections, directing to the Passages therein. And also please to take notice, That* William Rogers, *(who is first concerned in this Treatise) is not ignorant what great Labour and Pains I have taken with him more privately, to inform his Understanding and allay his Heat, by divers large Answers in Manuscript, (unto his Gain-saying, Accusing and Reviling Letters and Papers) amounting to much more than what's herein contained in Answer to his seventh Part of his* Christian-Quaker; *but instead of any fair ingenuous Reply, or acknowledgment of the Truth from him, he hath slighted me and my* Christian-Labours *and* Endeavours, *sometimes casting Dirt upon me, yet giving the* GO-BY *to the greater part of my Writings, seeming rather desirous to be some-body in Print against us, as one affecting* Popularity *(though in a perverse Work) the more publickly to manifest his Revengeful Spirit, in Abusing, Scandalizing and casting undeserved* ODIUMS *upon those whom his*

his Spight and Malice is most bent against; and I expect no better Treatment from him, and such exalted Spirits; I expect the Hatred of Scorners for rebuking them, and for this my Christian Conscientious Labour. *Howbeit, I doubt not but this shall have its Effect, for the clear Information and Advantage of many simple honest Hearts. And I can say,* Surely my Judgment is with the Lord, and my Reward is with my God, *Isa.* 49. 4.

Several Testimonies and Answers are already extant in Print against William Rogers's *wicked Books, as by* Thomas Ellwood (*his* ANTIDOTE) *and divers others. Surely it would be more reputable for him to desist and lay aside his daring Confidence and evil Attempts against the Servants of Christ, and ingenuously and humbly submit to the Truth; for our God (no doubt) will finally and signally rebuke that Rebellious, Exalted Spirit of Strife and Contention.*

To him who is the Righteous Judge of all I freely commit my Cause (with my Friends) in this Concern, for 'tis his own. And I do tenderly refer the spreading of this Treatise to the Discretion of faithful Friends, where they shall see a Necessity and Service for the Truth. I not designing nor desiring this may

be

be otherwiſe or farther expoſed to the view of the World, but where any of theſe Adverſaries or their Party have given (or do give) occaſion by ſpreading theirs; as there are ſome buſie Agents among them, that neither regard the Fear of God therein, nor the Reputation of his Truth or People, in ſpreading their defaming Books and Pamphlets: for which Treacherous Injurious Work, I am aſſured the Righteous Judge of all will Reckon with both the Authors and Spreaders thereof. To each of whom this Scripture appears juſtly applicable, viz. *Jer.* 2. 19. Thine own Wickedneſs ſhall Correct thee, and thy Back-ſliding ſhall Reprove thee; Know therefore and ſee that it is an Evil thing and bitter, that thou haſt forſaken the Lord thy God, and that my fear is not in thee, ſaith the Lord God of Hoſts. *I wiſh they may yet find a place of Repentance and Forgiveneſs, before the Judgment be executed which hangs over their Heads.*

G. W.

Judgment fixed upon the Accuſer of our Brethren.

CHAPTER I.

§. 1. W. R's Hue-and-Cry *prov'd an empty Flouriſh.* §. 2. *His Detraction and Reviling.* §. 3. *He is proved guilty of Reproaching the People called* Quakers *in general.* §. 4. *His Conceſſions to Truth do not prove him conſcientious in his writing, nor the* Penman *guilty of Blaſphemy.* §. 5. *His ſlighting and inſulting way of writing, his own abaſement.* §. 6. *His writing in's own Juſtification to clear himſelf from giving Judgment on Reports and Jealouſies, call'd in queſtion, and prov'd untrue by divers Inſtances.* §. 7. *His Reflection on* G. F. A. P. *and my ſelf about the* Barbadoes *Subſcription, (which we had denyed) proved Malicious and Unjuſt.* §. 8. *His compariſon between ſome of our Friends and Pope* Leo *the tenth; ſhewing more favour to the Pope than to Friends,* &c. §. 9. *His rendring* R. R.

(*and the* Pen-man) *like* Papists, *for quoting some of their Authors, brings great Reflection & Contradiction on himself.* §. 10. *He upbraids us often with the words* [Learn'd Friend] *yet useth the same word* Learned *to a Friend.* §. 11. *His false Suggestion and Jealousie of* great Idolatry, *touching* G. F. *and his sordid abuse of* John Blaikling, *and foul Untruth and Infamy therein manifest.* §. 12. *His Charge against* J. B. *about ascribing eternal Honour, and Perversion of his Intention; and against G. F. about Infallibility, distinguished.* §. 13. *His denying the sence of his and party's own words for a select Company of Elders and Deacons, to order in Church Affairs.* §. 14. *His pretence for amicable Conference, Hypocritical: His charge of meer Hypocrisie and Deceit, and the Fruits of manifest Injustice, abusive and unjust.*

§. 1. AS concerning *William Rogers's* Hue-and-Cry after the Name of the *Pen-man* of a Treatise entituled, *The Accuser of our Brethren cast down*; and that this *Hue-and-Cry* is in pursuance of his Name, because not subscribed thereunto, *page* 1.

How Insincerely and Fallaciously does he herein begin with a silly Boast, an empty Flourish and Vapour, containing also an unjust

anjaſt Reflection, compared with his falſe Scoff, (pag. 21.) i. e. *That the Pen-man was aſhamed that his Name ſhould be publiſh'd with the great Bull, entituled,* The Accuſer, *&c.* Which is a falſhood alſo. And why an *Hue-and-Cry* after his Name? He is not fled into Obſcurity, nor any Criminal, Treaſonable or Fellonious Perſon in any ſenſe, that an *Hue-and-Cry* need to be divulg'd in Print after his Name. Nor has he either deny'd or conceal'd his concern in that Book which *W. R.* falſly terms *The great Bull,* when modeſtly asked. But why is *W. R.* ſo very ignorant of his Name, that he muſt needs make the noiſe of an *Hue-and-Cry* after it? when but in pag. 25. he pretends a Deſcription of the Perſon, and of his Habit, to wit, As being one that *hath forgotten his low and mean Eſtate, and arrived to a Beautiful City-dreſs, &c.* And this is not all; but in pag. 34. he queries about the *Pen-man,* as having been that *no mean Perſon (viz.* of our Society) *that hath ſolicited the Powers under which we have peaceably lived, &c.* Could he ſo poſitively deſcribe the Pen-man's dreſs and condition, and yet not find out his Name without an *Hue-and-Cry* in Print after it? What empty Flouriſhes does this Perſon dreſs himſelf in? But what *Beautiful City-Dreſs* is that he reflects upon the *Pen-man,* that becomes not

Humility, or his Call to the work of the Miniſtry, or his ſoliciting the Powers on behalf of ſuffering Friends? And wherein is he condemnable of Exceſs in that caſe of his Habit or Dreſs? And wherein does he exceed all W. R's Brethren, even them he has counted Honourable? I would have him ſpeak out plainly in this matter, and not to mutter and ſmite in the dark.

§. 2. He ſays, *He will not conclude the Pen-man to be a Vagrant, a Night-Bird, a Wanderer,* &c. *becauſe his Name is not to his work,* pag. 1. And what, if he'l not thence conclude him ſuch an one, what better Character does he give him, both by the Inſtance and comparing *his or his Brethren's Actions to the ugly Vizzard of a Night-walker?* pag. 3. Thus he detracts and reviles.

§. 3. He affirms it *A notorious Untruth, that his Book contains Reproach againſt the People called* Quakers *in general; and that the Pen-man quotes not a word to ſhew it ſo,* pag. 2. But his Affirmation we may rather juſtly conclude a notorious Untruth. For in his Preface, p 6. to the firſt part of his (falſly ſtiled) *Chriſtian-Quaker,* he thus reflects upon the People called *Quakers* (which was quoted by us) viz. "*Theſe kinds of Declara-*
"*tions frequently publiſht amongſt the aforeſaid*
"*People, viz.* Let's exclude the Wiſdom,
"and

"and have an Eye to the Brethren, &c. *I.* "*cannot but be full of Jealouſie, that theſe* "*things have a tendency to inſinuate Submiſſion* "*without Conviction, and nurture up Ignorance* "*inſtead of Wiſdom, as much as ever* "*was, where this Maxim, to wit,* Ignorance "is the Mother of Devotion, *is, &c.* By all which 'tis apparent, that his Book contains unjuſt Reproach upon the People call'd *Quakers* in general, as being under ſuch a Popiſh blind Miniſtry. For what means [*the aforeſaid People*] but the People called *Quakers* in general? See now, that which he calls a notorious Untruth, is proved apparently true from his own Reflection on the People called *Quakers*, and therefore he himſelf thereby proved in the notorious Untruth. Was it not a Reflection upon the Church of *Thyatira* to ſuffer the woman *Jezabel* to teach and ſeduce, &c? And what better doth his Reflection on the ſaid People render them?

§. 4. He ſays, *He finds what's cited out of his Book of above Eighty Sheets, is leſs than Two, and one conſiderable part thereof acknowledged to be Conceſſions to the Truth, ſo that the Light ſometimes interpoſeth.* But then he judges this *Inconſiſtent* with that ſenſe, viz. *That his way of writing is void of Conſcience, Reaſon and Religion.* From whence he infers upon the *Pen-man* (as he calls him) *Is*

it not hence plain, that ſuch a ſenſe renders thoſe very things acknowledged to be interpoſed from the Light it ſelf, to be void of Conſcience, Reaſon and Religion? And then crys out at an hideous rate, as if he had wholly knock'd down his Reſpondent; *O notorious Blaſphemy!——The Pen-man acted in the Dark, ſhown himſelf unworthy of the name of a Man——May without abuſe be numbred amongſt ſuch ſort of Beaſts at* Epheſus——*Unreaſonable men——I have already prov'd the Penman Unreaſonable and Blaſphemous; yet he may be termed a man, though a very Wicked one, &c.* pag. 2,3. with more Aggravations. This is the Perſon that complains of a *great Bull againſt him*; but obſerve his *furious Bull* here, and what a wild one! and how outragiouſly mad and falſe in his Inference! What's the matter with him on which he is ſo furious? It is *that his way of writing is deemed void of Conſcience, Reaſon, Religion, &c.* becauſe it has been confeſt, *That the Light ſometimes interpoſeth and makes him concede to Truth.* But does it hence follow, that theſe very things interpoſed by the Light, are eſteemed void of Reaſon or Religion in themſelves? No ſuch matter: The major part of this work appears ſuch, and he is meaſured by the major part thereof. A man may juſtly be adjudged a Wicked Perſon, when the greateſt part of his life

life is such, though he may both speak and act some right things, when the Light comes over him, and convicts him, as *Balaam* did, and some of the wicked Kings of *Israel*, with many others: Yea, and the Devil himself, though a Lyar from the beginning, yet is made to grant and speak some Truths, when over-powered, though contrary to his Nature. Besides, we do not believe our Adversary to be Conscientious in what the Light interposeth through him, any more than that *Balaam* was a good man, when his heart was evil: Nor can the Devil's confessing to Truth at any time render him a good Devil, nor of tender Conscience, his Nature being contrary to Truth and Goodness.

§. 5. But there lies another great Reflection in the case upon *W. R.* in his charging the *Pen-man* (suppose my self or any other of our second day's Meeting) with *Notorious Blasphemy, acting in the dark, being unworthy the name of a Man, numbering him among the Beasts at* Ephesus, *with whom* Paul *fought; having already proved him Unreasonable and Blasphemous*, as boastingly and falsly he pretends; comparing this also with what he saith of the said Treatise entituled, *The Accuser of our Brethren cast down*, viz. *'Tis with me to take a little notice thereof; I say again, a little notice, that so the Reader*

may not think, me ſo Impertinent as to trouble the Preſs with ſo great a Volumn, as a full Anſwer to every Impertinency, &c. Thus *W. R.* p. 14. chap. 2.

See now, at what a Villifying and Inſulting rate this man writes, and how Wicked and Deſpicable he has rendred the *Pen-man*, (as his term is.) Now [*W. R.*] ſuppoſing thou takeſt my ſelf, or any other of my Brethren to be the Perſon thou chiefly ſmites at, how conſiſtent art thou in thy work to ſpend ſo much Time, Labour and Coſt in writing and printing againſt ſuch a mean, inconſiderable and undeſerving Perſon, in thy account, as *unworthy the Name of a Man, but rather to be numbred among unreaſonable Beaſts?* One would think it ſhould be far beneath a Perſon of thy Hight, Rank and Quality, as thy flouriſhing Vaunts beſpeak thee, thus to abaſe thy ſelf, as to ſpend ſo much time and coſt upon ſuch an Inferior, Irrational and Inconſiderable Perſon in thy high Thoughts. But art not thou a great Defamer and Oppoſer in thy ſaid Charge of *Notorious Blaſphemy*, and of being *unworthy the Name of a Man, &c?* Is this thy Chriſtianity? Who will believe thee, thinkeſt thou, that are not of thy own Party? And ſeeing thou art pleaſed to ſignifie *what little notice 'tis with thee to take of our Treatiſe*, we cannot but take notice of thy lofty and ſlighty

ſlighty way of writing. However, we have no reaſon to take this thy *little Notice* for an Anſwer; for thou haſt collected and replied to ſo little of the matter, and haſt ſo much given the GO-BY to the principal and greateſt part of our ſaid Treatiſe, as one that has found out the craft of Evaſion, that 'tis a little notice indeed thou haſt taken, and thy work deſerves but little notice to be taken of by others, unleſs to evince thy Envy and its Falſhood, *&c.* Thy pretence of *Unreaſonableneſs* in thy Reſpondent, will not hide thy Loftineſs and Contempt, nor excuſe thy ſhifting Evaſions from thoſe things that are moſt material and weighty upon thee; which every Ingenuous *Reader* may eaſily perceive, in comparing our ſaid Treatiſe againſt the *Accuſer of the Brethren*, and thy *Seventh Part* againſt ours together.

§. 6. Thou writes much in thy own Juſtification, and to clear thy ſelf of giving judgment on Reports and Jealouſies, though frequent in thy great Book: Thou on thy own behalf ſayſt, *I can in Truth delare, that I have not at any time poſitively aſſerted any thing, but what I either know, or have had ſufficient proof, as may render my Pen blameleſs therein*, pag. 3.

Upon which I would ſeriouſly ask thee, What ſufficient proof haſt thou that that

was

was *E. Burrough*'s Epiſtle, which thou haſt cited for his Epiſtle, and poſitively aſſerted it two or three times to be *E. B*'s Epiſtle in thy firſt part of the *Chriſtian-Quaker* (falſly ſo called?) which I and many more do not believe it to be *E. B*'s for divers cauſes; having ſeen *John Parrots* Name only to a Tranſcript of it in a Perſons Hand, writing, i. e. *J. Batho*'s, that was for a time an Admirer of *J. P.* How durſt thou be ſo poſitive in aſſerting it to be *E. B*'s? I dare Challenge thee to produce it under *E. B*'s own hand, to any of us that knew his hand, if thou tookeſt it not up upon an Implicit belief, truſt and report. As we can prove, thou haſt written many things from thy own Jealouſies and Reports, only with this proviſion in ſome other things, *If Reports be true*, &c. to ſave thee from the cenſure of drawing a poſitive Concluſion; and then what weight or credit does this add to much of thy Work?

And I would know, what ſufficient proof thou haſt of thy Story, *That a Friend of known credit did declare, that twelve pence was paid in* London, *on demand of ſo much for a Certificate, in order to the Accompliſhment of his Marriage, which otherwiſe might have been obſtructed*, p. 5. I pray thee produce thy Author and Informer for this Story, and what Friend of known Credit did ſo declare?

clare? for 'tis not credited by many. However, thou art positive in it, by the following words, *viz. This being done under the form of Government contended for*, &c. Which I am sure is a positive Lye; for we have no such Action under the form of Government contended for among us, as to obstruct any Marriage for Non-payment of twelve Pence for a Certificate. Such practice is so far from relating to Church Government among us, that 'twas never own'd by us, as to obstruct any Marriage on that account.

And what positive Proof hast thou, *That the Manuscript of the Primmer, subscribed by* G. F. *and* E. H. *was sold for thirty Pound?* Enquiry has been made about this Accusation, and 'tis positively deny'd by the Person concerned; though these Stories thou hast instanced as *tokens of Apostacy and Innovation*, p. 5.

And what if *E. H.* was a Clark for his yearly Salary, does that hinder his Credit in his signing our said Treatise on behalf of our Meeting? Or was his yearly Salary to extend to pay for all the many Certificates relating to Marriages, and the Expences thereupon, who many times was known to be deprived of his natural Rest, in writing to serve Truth and Friends? And was't not lawful for him to have a Livelihood for his great pains in Truth's service,

who

who loſt his place and livelihood for Truth, and ended his dayes in Peace? One would think, that *W. R.* ſhould be aſhamed to aſperce or cloud his Reputation after his Death.

§. 7. His Reflection upon the *Barbadoes Meeters* (as he calls them) about a Subſcription, and upon *G. F.* my ſelf, (and conſequently on *A. P.* who alſo was concerned with us) as *ſeeming to ſew Pillows under their Armholes*, p. 4. appears Malicious, as well as Unjuſt, being a Subſcription from the firſt exploded by us, and ſince ſeen in its defects, and condemned by themſelves on our *Chriſtian Advice* and real *Diſlike* ſhewn them in our Epiſtle, which *W. R.* is ſo partial and unjuſt, as to omit the words containing our Judgment and Diſlike of it. Hath not he and *Francis Bugg* and *Tho. Criſp* herein exactly reſembled the Devil, the old Accuſer of the Brethren, in accuſing the Innocent, and charging Perſons after Repentance, with that which they have repented of, which is Satan's unjuſt Proſecution? And *W. R.* unjuſtly alſo lays hold of theſe friendly and tender Expreſſions, wherein we ſhewed regard to Friendſhip, and anſwered that which was tender and good in them: For inſtead of ſhewing himſelf impartial and juſt, he minces and clouds the matter on our parts, only telling the

the Reader, *We ſeem to diſlike the latter part thereof*——And in other parts, *ſeem to diſlike the wording thereof*, p. 4, & 28. But is not ſo honeſt as to give the Reader a particular Citation and Notice of our real judgment in our own words in that caſe. As in diſlike of their oppoſing the *Judgment of the Spirit of God in the Meetings to any particular Meaſure.* We plainly ſignified, "That "this would be the way to bring them all "from the meaſure of the Spirit in their own "particulars——And that all muſt be left "to the univerſal Spirit in their own mea-"ſures thereof——Now this would make "the Belief, which is in the Light, and "the meaſure of the Spirit in their own "particulars, not one with the univerſal "Spirit, *&c.* The univerſal Spirit of God "has unity with the leaſt meaſure now, "as it was in the Apoſtles days, who kept "every one to their own meaſure; which "was both the great Rule and Line of the "New Creature in the Believers and Saints "then.

And in diſlike of their *ſubſcription*, we ſignified, "That all are to give up to the Uni-"verſal Spirit of God in their own particu-"lars, in which ſpirit they have unity and "fellowſhip, without outward ſubſcription-——And further, "Now as for your Sub-"ſcription to an outward Tye, be above "ſuch things. Now

Now let the ſerious and impartial judge; Is not here a manifeſt Diſlike ſhown, and Judgment given? And therefore the greater Injuſtice in our Adverſary to cite the Paper from *Barbadoes*, either to proye us guilty of *Aiming at Dominion and Lordſhip over Faith, Conſcience and Property*, pag. 4. or that *the ſaid Paper is one part of the fruits of the pretended eſtabliſht Government*, as he moſt falſly ſaith, p. 27. And the *Lordſhip over Eſtates and Conſciences*, he infers thence. He would deceitfully inſinuate and charge upon us *ſewing Pillows under their Armholes*, calling them *dear Friends*, with other tender Expreſſions; which when he has cited, without the words containing our Judgment, as to Fact, he then ſays, *THIS ſhews no diſlike to the ſaid Paper.* Which is a very deceitful and unjuſt way of writing in Controverſie: I would not deal thus by the worſt Adverſary in the World, to entitle him to that which he has diſowned, and to leave out the words of *Diſlike* and *Judgment* on the Miſtake or Error ſo diſown'd, and to pick and take up thoſe other words which are tender, relating to the Perſons, and not to the Fact; and then to cry, *This ſhews no diſlike thereof*, &c. What if *THIS* ſhews it not, when enough beſides ſhews it? But is it indeed a Crime to call any *dear Friends*, who do commit an Error or Miſtake? No

ſure,

ſure, that will not hold. Did not *Paul* call the *Corinthians*, *DEARLY BELOVED*, 1 *Cor* 10. 14. (ſee *James* 1. 16. compar'd with cap. 5.) and yet ſome among them did Err, were in Diviſions, &c. 1 *Cor*. 3. And did he not call the *Galatians BRETHREN*? *Gal*. 6. 18. yet charges them with being *Fooliſh*. Were not the ſeven Churches of *Aſia* commended in many things, when yet there were a few things againſt divers of them? *Rev*. 2 & 3 chapters. O Diſ-ingenious Perſon, (*W.R.*) I am aſhamed of thy Partial, Unconſcionable & Unjuſt dealing! Is this thy beſt way to prove us guilty of *aiming at Dominion and Lordſhip over Faith, Eſtates and Conſciences?* How miſerably comeſt thou off in thy Evil Attempts!

§. 8. That *We have given occaſion to be rendred in ſome things as bad as* Papiſts (or as *having a Papiſtical Countenance*, p. 5.) is a notorious Slander: And that *in ſome other things we have given occaſion to be rendred* MUCH WORSE *in our Practices and Treatments, than the very Papiſts themſelves*, (p. 6.) is alſo a foul Reproach. And his excuſing Pope *Leo* his Bull againſt *Martin Luther*, rather than our Friends, is no Proof, but rather ſhews himſelf more on the Popes ſide than on our Friends, having ſpoken more for Pope *Leo* the tenth than our Friends,

Friends, † on the inſtance he gives, to wit, *That in the Popes Bull forty two Articles of Doctrine, held by the ſaid* Martin, *were mentioned, and declar'd Erronious; by which the World was notified of the reputed Crimes laid to his Charge. But in the Papers ſubſcribed by* Charles Marſhall *& Sixty five more, againſt* J. W. *and* J. S. *nothing that may properly be termed particular matter of Fact, or Erronious Doctrine is therein laid down, unleſs their general words now following may be termed ſuch, to wit, That they* **have Evil Deſigns, deſpiſe Heavenly Dignities, promote falſe Jealouſies, ſet up a kind of a ſtandard of Separation,** pag. 6. And is not this matter of Fact, to ſet up a ſtandard of Separation? Where then is his Compariſon between Pope *Leo* the tenth, and us? And how were the *Pope's proceedings in that reſpect, far more*

† A Pope reputed no better than an Atheiſt, a Prophaner of the holy Scriptures, a Perſon careleſs of Religion and Piety; an Avaritious Corrupt Perſon, who made great advantage of his impious Indulgencies & Pardons, &c How unjuſt & impious therefore is our Adverſary *W. R.* to rake ſo many Inſtancies (as he hath done) out of the *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, of Wicked Popes and their Agents, to compare, brand and ſcandalize Us or any of our Friends withal, who abhor Popery and all the Popes Corruptions.

more juſt than our Friends? (as he ſignifies) p. 6. See what Favour and Charity he has for the Pope, more than for our Friends. The cauſing or making Diviſions and Separations in the Apoſtles days was then ſuch matter of Fact, as that they were to be marked and avoided that did ſo; though our Adverſary does not own this to be properly termed *particular matter of Fact* laid down, when plainly mentioned in writing.

Thus I have conſidered him on his own terms, and taken notice how he juſtifies the Pope's proceedings, as far more juſt than our Friends, whilſt he would be reckoned againſt Popery.

§. 9. That *we would not be rendred like Papiſts*, is true; *but that the Pen-man ſeems to marr it all again* (in refering the Reader to a ſhort Tract, writ by our Friend *R. Richardſon*) is falſe: And though both *Heatheniſh, Papiſtical and Proteſtant Authors of divers ſorts* (as he ſaith) *are quoted in the ſaid Tract*; 'tis no reaſonable Inference, that therefore *R. R.* is like a *Papiſt*, or like all thoſe he quotes, unleſs *W. R.* would like it well to be ſo reflected upon (*Argumentum ad hominem*) as reſembling a *Papiſt* in his quoting Pope *Leo's* Bull againſt *Martin Luther, as having ſome more pretended ground whereon to place a Judgment, and as far more juſt in his proceedings than* C. M. *and ſixty five*

Friends more. As alſo in his quoting the Parliament of *Papiſts* at *Paris*, p. 31. Does not this then by his own reflection, render him more like to a *Papiſt* than a ſtrict *Quaker*? Whilſt he'l needs have *R. R.* &c. like *Papiſts* for quoting *Heatheniſh*, *Papiſtical* or *Proteſtant* Authors; yet he himſelf quoting Pope *Leo*'s Bull againſt *M. Luther*, and the ſaid Parliament of *Papiſts* againſt our Friends: Let him wind himſelf out from a Self-condemnation in this, and other points of like nature, if he can.

§. 10. He ſeems much to upbraid us with the words, *Learned Friend R. R.* he throws them over and over upon the Pen-man: he often twits us with them, and yet but in his 8th page he tells us of the Memory of the *Learned Samuell Fiſher*. See how the man makes work to his own Confutation. Though our words in the Copy were *Learned in the Truth*; how the words [*in the Truth*] were left out, I know not. And yet a Perſon being *Learned* in any reſpect, it can be no ſin to ſay, *He is Learned*; whilſt 'tis not to admire *outward Learning* or *Acquirement* above its place; which I am ſure was not intended on our parts.

§. 11. Of our ſaying, That it is at leaſt ſuſpected for a great Slander, viz. *That ſome do look upon* G. F. *as that Prophet, whom the Lord by* Moſes *propheſied, he would raiſe up: And*

And that he is not ignorant, that ſuch there are, &c. Our Adverſary in his inference has perverted the words from [*at leaſt ſuſpected*] to [*only ſuſpected*, and *bear ſuſpicion*] when as [*at leaſt ſuſpected*] implies more than a bear Suſpicion: And therefore his ſuppoſition thereupon (and his Jealouſie) *That the ſecret Reaſon was, that on Conference with* G. F. *he could not in Truth deny the ſame; And that he will not deny it*, p. 9, 10. This is a Preſumptious Imagination: for I affirm, *G. F.* does deny the ſame, in reference to himſelf, as a particular Man or Perſon, whoſe days and years are limited; only the Truth of the Immortal Seed, Chriſt in him, (as he is in every true Believer, Male and Female) he ſtands to maintain, againſt all Oppoſers, and perſecuting Gain-ſayers and Apoſtates. And therefore his Jealouſie, *That at length this Controverſie, as mannaged, &c. will occaſion the diſcovery of great Idolatry*, pag. 10. ſhews, that he ſuggeſts falſe things ſtill upon Jealouſie, to render *G. F. &c* Odious and Obnoxious.

That the *Pen-man offers not a word to prove him guilty of ſordid and foul Abuſe againſt* John Blaikling, p. 10. is a ſordid & foul Untruth; ſee our Treatiſe againſt the Accuſer of our Brethren, pag. 246. where we offer what he ſays againſt *J. B.* and others, *Writing or Signing any thing, right or wrong, and compa-*

ring him to a Paraſite, to an Earthly Prince: Here's more than one word offered to prove *W. R*'s foul Abuſe againſt *J. B.* &c. who to add to his Abuſe, now ſaith, J. B. *has acted the part of a Sycophantizing Paraſite in writing touching* G. F. And what's this but to render him a meer *Tale-bearer* and *Flatterer*, or an *Informing Flatterer* for his own Ends and Advantage? This ſtill appears ſordid and abuſive, thus infamouſly to brand any Friend or Perſon Conſcientious towards God.

§. 12. As for his aſcribing *Eternal Honour* either to *G. F*'s Life, or to him or his Soul, as joyned to the Spotleſs Life; wherein *J. B.* can mean no other than the Life of Chriſt Jeſus in him, I do not underſtand that this can prove him a *Sycophantizing Paraſite.* For that Chriſt is our Life, the Life of every true Believer, is plain; that *Eternal Honour* belongs to him, is not diſputed. In the next place, *He that Honours me*, ſaith the Lord, *him will I Honour.* The Queſtion is, Whether this *Honour* is not *Eternal*, (*a parte poſt*) that is, *Everlaſting* to the Souls of the Righteous, whom God never forſakes? Then how can any ſuch ever looſe that Honour that God gives? And does our Adverſary believe, that nothing may be ſaid to be *Eternal*, that had a beginning, as to Man? Had not *Eternal Salvation* and

Eternal

Eternal Redemption a beginning, as to the Creature, yet *Eternal?* But *W. R.* notes in the Margent, That *Eternal Honour is due to none but God, who alone, and not the words of Mortal Man, is able to nouriſh the Soul which is Immortal:* And all this to confute *John Blaikling.* Wherein he greatly perverts J. B's Intention, and miſrepreſents his words; for he ſpoke of the *dropping of his tender words in the Lords Love*; and *W. R.* tells of the *words of mortal man.* When the Apoſtle ſaid, *Hitherto I have fed you with Milk, and not with ſtrong Meat*; Was this a *Soul's feeding* or *nouriſhing*, yea or nay? And was the Apoſtle's preaching the Goſpel in a living Miniſtry only the words of mortal mam? No ſure: *For our Goſpel came not unto you in word only, but in Spirit and in Power.*

His charge againſt *G. F. that he hath deſcribed himſelf one unto whom Infallible Judgment hath been committed in all things*, is denyed by *G. F.* though he owns the *Judgment* committed to him of God in matters of Salvation and things Spiritual, to be *Infallible.*

§. 13. His Marginal Note appears manifeſtly untrue, viz. *That he has not written one word to ſhew that ſuch a ſenſe is his ſenſe*, to wit, *That he and ſome others of his party ſeem to be only for a ſelect company of Elders and Deacons to order in Church Affairs about the Poor,*

Marriages, &c. p. 11. What then means his exclaiming ſo much againſt our Meetings about Church Affairs, as being *an uncertain number of uncertain qualified Perſons?* and his Brethrens Paper of Separation in *Weſtmerland*, quoted by him, plainly limiting to *Choſen men, Choſen, Imployed and Authorized by the Churches?* ſee our ſaid Treatiſe, pag 119, 120. Now if his ſenſe was not for a ſelect company, then he and his Brethren Subſcribers of the ſaid Paper, are of contrary ſenſes. But then how does he conſiſt therein with himſelf, in his charging us with *Uſurpation*, and upbraiding us, p. 19. with *ſuch a form of Church-Government, as hath admitted of no rightful Succeſſion or Conſtitution by Election, &c?* What Foundation or Certainty can we find in this mans writing? One while he is comparing us with the *Pope*, another while he charges us with *Uſurpation, for want of rightful Succeſſion or Conſtitution of any Supream Perſon or Perſons*, pag. 19. This is the man that would ſeem to oppoſe *Popery* ſo much, whilſt he is bringing a *Popiſh plea* of *Succeſſion* againſt us. But this is like much of his Work: I wiſh he were better compoſed.

§. 14. He pretends greatly to be for an *Amicable Conference*, p. 12. whilſt he is ſo far from *Amity*, that he has appeared an

open

open Enemy, abuſing and reviling us in Print

And what, if his Letter was not read publickly at our yearly Meeting, at the time of its being delivered? What reaſon had Friends to interrupt their publick and weighty concerns of Truth with the then reading of an Adverſary's letter? eſpecially ſeeing divers of us took care to anſwer him therein ſo ſoon as the Meeting was over; and were not wanting afterward to give him a Meeting thereupon.

His charging us with a *piece of meer Hypocriſie and Deceit for pretending to Amicable Conference*, is a ſordid Abuſe to my knowledge: For many of us have not been awanting in that caſe, but have been ready to Amicable Conference, before *W. R.* and ſome of Party with him, turned open Adverſaries, Gain-ſayers and Enemies to us, whoſe Enmity has made them, (eſpecially him) uncapable of Amicable Conference. And he may be aſhamed of his pretended *ſeaſonable* Hue and Cry *after the Name of the Pen-man*; his *Hue and Cry* ſhews his own Complexion and Image not to be innocent.

And his Charge of the *Fruits of manifeſt Injuſtice, that his Letter was not read in our yearly Aſſembly, being* (he ſays) *a Letter from a Friend, eſpecially when not Excommunicated.* This is unjuſt and untrue in the

firſt place, and ſhews an Imperious, Lordly, Exalted Spirit, thus to charge us with manifeſt Injuſtice: And why ſo? but becauſe we did not ſerve his turn, we did not obſerve his time and manner in reading his Letter, when and where he would have had us: We did not lay all the weighty Affairs of Friends and Truth aſide preſently to read *William Rogers*'s Letter; we did not gratifie his Irregular interpoſing; and therefore we muſt now be cenſured in Print, charg'd with *Irregularity*, *Anſwering without order of the Meeting*, *Lordſhip and ſlaviſh Submiſſion*, *fruits of manifeſt Injuſtice*, *&c.* He ſeems very hot on this occaſion, and a Perſon very ſtrict and zealous for *Regularity* and *Order of the Meeting*, when he thinks it may ſerve his own turn: But at other times he hugely exclaims againſt *Outward Uniformity*, *Orders*, *outward Rules*, *Preſcriptions*, *Directions*, *Impoſition*, *&c.* But now it ſeems, it is againſt ſuch as are not of his own ſetting up or impoſing. And yet he moſt highly juſtifies *whatever he has written*; *which we either pretend to anſwer*, *or to ſhew diſſatisfaction in*, *as remaining undetected*, *and in no reſpect unbecoming a Chriſtian Pen*, p. 14. We have only his own Self-commendation for this; wherein his Self-confidence and wilful Blindneſs is to be wondered at.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

§. 1. W. R. *queſtions* Ellis Hookes's *Credit, and groſly abuſeth our Meeting in* London, *for writing in behalf of our publick Meetings and People called* Quakers. §. 2. *Of the inward Government and ſpiritual Kingdom of Chriſt in his Church. How far his Miniſters or Servants are concerned therein as Inſtruments in his hand: Not ſtrictly* Repreſentatives *thereof. Our Propoſitions therein unanſwered by* W. R. *He evades and gives the* GO-BY *to them.* §. 3. *His late oppoſition to viſible Perſons being inveſted with Power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, Orders, &c. in an outward form of Government, now Overthrown by himſelf, and the point gain'd upon his own Variation and Conceſſion, and he farther queſtioned in the point.* §. 4. *His miſtake in his Alluſion againſt repreſenting the Government of the King, and concerning his Prerogative,* W. R. *unskilful in the point.* §. 5. *Of the Cauſe eſpouſed by us, no other than the Cauſe of Chriſt his Church and People.* W. R. *like a perſecuting Informer, his work tending to bring more ſevere Perſecution upon us; his repreſenting us as in ſeeming Union with the Papiſtical*

Papistical party, and comparing us with Popes, the Church of Rome, *&c. Devilish, Malicious and Fallacious, yet most silly and impertinent, and his Resemblances full of Falshood, and his Similitudes abusive and shallow, bringing great Reflection upon himself, acting the part of a silly* Sophister, *yet proud and scornful.* §. 6. W. R's *Cry for Justice against* G. F. *and who must be the Judges, and what Judicature, questioned. His malicious, dubious & proofless Reflections upon the Pen-man, Ministring Friends and yearly Meetings, and comparing them to the Popes General Councils; and his Instance of the Bishop of* Bitonto's *Commendation of Pope* Paul *the third (with his Blasphemous Doctrine about the Light) prov'd unjust, and the Similitude impertinent and grosly false, &c. His accounts against Popes, &c. (gathered out of the* History of the Council of Trent) *he unjustly applies to our Friends.* §. 7. *His Similitude of* Disumon, *with the Pope, to render us worse than he: And his Comparison between our Friends and the Popish Lords Inquisitors, and his uncharitable Censure about punishing his Body, and taking away his Estate, all unjust. Of our standing by our Treatise entituled,* The Accuser, &c.

§. 1

§. 1. HIs queſtioning the Credit of *Ellis Hookes*, *A Clark for his yearly Salary* (as he calls him) and inſinuating againſt the *Meeting*, for whom he was a witneſs, as *not meriting the Name of Sober Conſcientious* Quakers; and as *being infatuated, &c.* cap. 2. p. 15. And why ſo, but becauſe they wrote in the Name of publick Meetings, & in the Name of the People call'd *Quakers?* Does this prove them Infatuated, or unworthy the Name of Sober Conſcientious *Quakers?* 'Tis a wonder he is not aſhamed thus manifeſtly to ſcandalize and abuſe ſo many Conſcientious, Sober and Underſtanding Perſons, when he knew not who they were in particular. Have we not often writ in the name and behalf of our Friends & People call'd *Quakers*, in their Vindication from the oppoſition and abuſes of Oppoſers and Gain-ſayers of Truth, in matters known to be univerſally own'd by them; and this both with their tacit Conſent and Approbation? Muſt we ſeek for a Deputation from the People called *Quakers* throughout *England, &c.* in all Caſes wherein there is a preſent neceſſity of their Vindication, when generally abuſed in Print by Adverſaries of divers ſorts? For I tell *W. R.* he merits not ſo much as the Name of a *Quaker*, in abuſing at leaſt the major part of them

them in Print, as he has done, to render them *Popiſh*, *Odious* and *Infamous*, and rather juſtifying the *Pope*, *and Lords of the* Spaniſh *Inquiſition*, p. 21. than many of them. And his *diſaffected* Party are not ſo numerous as he would have us think, p. 23. far ſhort (to be ſure) of thoſe he writes againſt and abuſeth in Print; for his ſmiting at the publick and faithful Miniſters (who are approved of moſt generally by the People called *Quakers*) is a Reflection and Scandal upon that People.

§. 2. Our obſervation on the 42d *Diſaffection* ſhews, that our Objection lies not againſt the *outward Government* under which we live, nor yet againſt the *inward Government* of *Chriſt*; for Chriſt's inward Government in his Church, and his ſpiritual Kingdom and extent thereof, as alſo our innocent Converſations towards the outward Government, we have plainly aſſerted in our Treatiſe againſt the Accuſer, pag. 114, 115, 116, & 118. Though *W. R*'s words are cited at large, more fully to ſhew his ſenſe and diſtinction upon the *inward Government of Chriſt*, where he adds, *viz. Which is not repreſented by Perſons viſible by carnal Eyes, inveſted with Power from him to execute outward Laws, Preſcriptions, Orders, Edicts or Decrees, in an outward form of Government viſible.* Wherein we reaſonably took

took his Objection to lie as much againſt *viſible Perſons* being ſo inveſted with Power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, Preſcriptions, &c. and againſt an *outward Form of Government, viſible in his Church*, as againſt *Chriſt's Government being* Repreſented *by Perſons viſible*. But now he pitches his Objection upon the word [*REPRESENTED*] queſtioning, *Whether it is not a Contradiction in common ſenſe, to conclude, That Perſons viſible can be the* Repreſentatives *of the inward Government of Chriſt?* Which was not our Aſſertion; nor did we conclude, that Perſons viſible are the *Repreſentatives* of Chriſt's inward Government, in a ſtrict ſence, abſolutely or ſolely as in Chriſt's ſtead: And therefore his Objection ſuppoſes that to be our poſition, which we never aſſerted. Yet not to looſe nor leſſen any part of Chriſts Government, we have plainly aſſerted, "That 'tis exerciſed "by him both *Immediately* and *Inſtrumentally* "in his Church: *Immediately* and princi-"pally by himſelf; and *Inſtrumentally* (in "ſome meaſure) by his Miniſters and Ser-"vants, as well as he teaches and inſtructs "both Immediately and Inſtrumentally; as in our firſt and ſecond unanſwered Propoſitions about Church Government. And therefore as we prefer Chriſt's inward and immediate Government by himſelf as

Principal;

Principal, and his governing *Inſtrumentally* by his Servants: But in *ſome Meaſure* (as our words are) this ſhews, that we do not render them the abſolute *Repreſentatives* of his Inward Government and ſpiritual Kingdom; though we may truly and tenderly aſſert, They do by the inward Aſſiſtance of the Power and Spirit of Chriſt, in ſome meaſure livingly *repreſent* or *ſignifie*, *declare and ſhew forth the inward and ſpiritual Government of Chriſt*, as being his faithful Servants and Ambaſſadours; yea, ſome are called *Ambaſſadours in Chriſt's ſtead*, in and through whom Chriſt miniſters, inſtructs, commands, orders and rules. And the holy Ghoſt made ſome Overſeers, and appointed Helps and Governments in the Church (as we have laid down in our third *Propoſition*) "Eſpecially for the ſake of the "younger and weaker Members, Children "and ſuch as are of under Age, as to Truth "and experience in the work of the Lord. Our Adverſary anſwers not this Propoſition, which is ſo plain, tender and ſubmiſſive to Chriſt, in his behalf and preference: And therefore *W. R*'s inferring and charging *the fruit of a confuſed Anarchical Principle* on us (in reference to our ſaid *Diſaffection*) follows not in Truth, but rather ſhews it to be the fruit of his own Prejudice and Enmity. From whence alſo his ſcornful Queſtion proceeds,

proceeds, viz. *Whether the Pen-man hath known, and hath in pivate a Catalogueof the Names of ſuch viſible Perſons, whom he may eſteem the Repreſentatives of Chriſt's inward Government?* pag. 16, 17. He fallaciouſly obtrudes and impoſes his word REPRESENTATIVES ſtill in this caſe upon us, extending it beyond our Intention, and what our words will bear; craftily evading and giving the *GO-BY* to our Propoſitions in the Caſe, where we ſignifie, *That* IN SOME MEASURE *Chriſt governs Inſtrumentally, &c.* ſee our five *Propoſitions* in our ſaid Treatiſe againſt the *Accuſer of the Brethren*, p. 114, 115, 116.

§. 3. Whereas we took his oppoſition to be *againſt viſible Perſons being concerned in an outward form of Government, and order in the Church of Chriſt.* Hereupon he ſhews himſelf very angry, and exclaims againſt the *weight of the Pen-man's Iniquity*, charges him with *Prevarication, inſinuating, as if according to my Principle* (ſays he) *there were not viſible order and form of Government under Chriſts Dominion, nor any viſible Perſons exerciſed in any outward Order under his Government*, p. 43. Whereby he has now plainly granted, that according to his Principle, *there is both viſible Order, and a form of Government under Chriſts dominion, and Viſible Perſons exerciſed in an outward order*

and

under his Government (for in the two contraries, his disowning the one, owns the other; his opposing the Negative grants the Affirmative herein.) But he then should have writ more distinctively, consistently and plain, in telling us, What *visible and outward form of Government and Order* he would set up? And what has he so much exclaim'd against, and not to have appeared so general in his opposition to *outward Orders, Forms, Rules, Prescriptions, Decrees*, &c. as he has done in divers passages of his Book; and particularly, that in his first part of his *Christian-Quaker*, p. 73. in his opposing the Establishment, or giving forth of *outward Orders, Prescriptions, Sentences* or *Decrees, as a Bond on the Consciences of Believers*, rendring this *more like the Old than the New Covenant*. And his opposing *Visible Persons being invested with Power from Christ to execute outward Laws, Prescriptions, Orders, Edicts or Decrees in an outward form of Government visible*; as 'tis plain in the Title-page of his third part. The frequent Reiteration of these and such like passages and Words, shew his Objection was against *Visible Persons being impowered by Christ to execute* (or, minister)

niſter) † *outward Laws, Orders,* &c. *in a viſible and outward form of Government*; elſe what needed he write ſo ſlightily & frequently againſt *outward* and *viſible form of Government*, *outward Laws, Edicts, Preſcriptions, Orders, Decrees,* &c? What's all his Noiſe come to on this account? Now he would not be thought, that his Principle is againſt *viſible Order* and *Form* of *Government under Chriſt's Dominion*; Nor againſt *ſome viſible Perſons being exerciſed in ſome outward Order under his Government:* Thus far the point is granted and gain'd upon him, and his Conceſſion thereto the farther confirm'd, in deeming our rendring his great Book to be againſt *Church-Government, outward Methods, Orders* and *Rules,* &c. *A falſe Aſſertion*; Though we cannot reckon that Book of his to look with a better Face in the mian purport and *Series* of it, eſpecially conſidering his *Third part*, from what's mentioned in the Title, and againſt *R. Barclay's* Book *for Church-Government*, and in many other places and paſſages of that Book, and in his Epiſtle in this his 7th part he is ſmiting at *Eſtabliſhing an outward Uniformity, outward Things,*

† By [*Execute*] I underſtand *miniſter* or *put in Practice*, and not in the common Law ſence of inflicting *corporal or pecuniary Puniſhments*; for that's not conſiſtent with the Government of a Chriſtian Church.

outward Directory, &c. But now we muſt take his meaning and principle to be not againſt *viſible Order* and *viſible Form* of *Government under Chriſt's dominion*, nor againſt *viſible Perſons being exerciſed therin*; How then ſhall we underſtand his meaning and principle? Why did he not then more plainly diſtinguiſh it firſt, and brought the Controverſie into a more narrow compaſs, and not have writ thus confuſedly and ſhatteredly, one while *againſt*, another while *for viſible outward Order* and *Form* of *Government* under Chriſts Dominion in his Church. [As in this Treatiſe the matter is further Evinced againſt him hereafter.]

But wherein lies his Charge of *Prevarication?* He gives us to know, it is in twining the Word REPRESENTED into CONCERNED, pag. 43. We are yet to ſeek and ſtudy, how to find this *Prevarication* pretended, conſidering the purport, tenure and conexion of his Words. For though now he owns *viſible Perſons* to be exerciſed or concerned in an *outward Form* of *Government* and *Order* under Chriſt's Dominion; yet not that his *inward Government* is repreſented by them; yet his Diſtinction before excluding viſible Perſons not only from repreſenting Chriſt's inward Government, but alſo from being inveſted with Power *to execute* (i. e. to miniſter, give

give forth, or put in practice) outward *Laws*, *Edicts*, &c. in an *outward Form* of *Government* Visible, appears to bespeak his sense than to exclude them from being concerned in an outward *Form* of *Government* and *Order* in the Church of Christ under his Dominion. For if they do in no sense or degree represent *Christ's Government*, how are they concern'd in it? And if they have no power to execute (minister, or put in practice) *outward Order* and *Form* of *Government visible:* How are they either exercised or concerned in an *outward form* or *order* of *Government under Christ's dominion*? But this is now granted us in the Affirmative So then, wherein must we understand *W. R*'s opposition to lie against *outward Order*, *outward Form* of *Church-Government*, *outward Laws*, *Edicts*, *Rules*, *Prescriptions*, &c? I presume, not against any of his own making, but against such as he calls *G. Fox*'s, &c. as he has told us of *a slighting* G. F's *Rules*, *Methods and Orders*, *with respect to Church-Government*; see the *Accuser*, &c. pag. 83. But then I would know, whether it is against *all*, or *some*, that *G. F.* has writ or given out? If he says, *not against all*, but *some*; then I intreat him to let's know, what SOME they are particularly? What *Instructions*, *Rules* or *Methods* they are he Condemns, and that he deems condem-

nable, as evil or unlawful in themſelves? We have divers times preſt for a *Catalogue* of them, that the *Controverſie* might be more plainly diſtinguiſhable, and brought into a narrow compaſs, which now lies not only prolix and tedious in *W. R's* Books, but alſo *ſcattered*, *confuſed* and *ambiguous* in his Writings, wanting in many places the ſupplement of his latter Thoughts and Meanings: So that when he has write one Book, it wants another to declare its meaning; he has taken a great compaſs to write a very little matter in.

§. 4. For his diſtinction between the words *Repreſented* and *Concerned*, he ſays, That *many thouſands are exerciſed in an outward Order, under the Government of the King, who if they ſhould thence declare, that they are the* Repreſentives *of his Government, 'twould be deem'd a Mood of Speech, tending to the annihillating of the King's Prerogative:* And concludes the like *in relation to Chriſt's Prerogative*, p. 43. But herein the man is under a Miſtake; in this Alluſion, his skill in the Law, and the King's Prerogative and Government has fail'd him in this point. For the King's Government is repreſented in all Courts of Judicature, legally acting in his Name and by his Power, whereby the King is look't upon to be preſent in all his Courts: Yea, every legal

legal Miniſter and Conſervator of the King's Peace, even from the Juſtice to the Sheriff & Conſtable or Peace-Officer does in his place and legal Office in ſome degree repreſent the Kings Government, in the doing Juſtice and Conſervation of his Peace: And this no ways leſſens, but promotes the King's legal Prerogative. For the King in the Eye of the Law is *Juſtitiarius Capitalis*, the Head or chief Juſtice, and hath his ſubordinate Miniſters and Juſtices under him, legally impowered by him, according to his juſt and legal Prerogative. Now ſeeing *W. R.* is ſo much out, and has loſt his aim in his Compariſon, theſe things are mentioned to rectifie his Judgment; And the Compariſon, as now ſtated, may be better applied to Chriſt's Kingdom and Government, who though he be the chief Overſeer and Shepherd, the great Apoſtle and Miniſter, the great Ruler and Governour, *&c.* he has his Overſeers, his Apoſtles, his Miniſters and Servants and Helps in Government, which is none other than *Chriſt's Government* in his Church and Kingdom, and under his Dominion; which I hope our Oppoſer dare not deny, however he differ with us in the Application.

§. 5. As concerning *an Angry Waſpiſh Pen*, wherewith thou twice over chargeſt the Pen-man, adding, *That the more he ſtirs*

therewith, the more will the Cauſe, which he eſpouſeth, ſtink, pag. 17, & 44. I muſt tell thee, *firſt*, I never met with a more Angry Waſpiſh Pen than thy own; though thy Malice and Wickedneſs hath been (in divers parts of our Book) deſervedly reprehended, thou haſt in much thereof been mildly treated. *2dly*, I know no cauſe eſpouſed by us therein, than the *Cauſe of Chriſt his Church and People*, which will live and remain ſweet and pretious to all the upright in Heart, when thy malicious Work and corrupt Cauſe will more and more appear naucious, loathſom, and ſtink above ground, till ſwept into the Pit from whence it came, and which thou art very near, and without Repentance canſt not eſcape it. *3dly*, What occaſion have we (or any of us) given thee to rage and roar againſt us, and like a perſecuting Informer, to go about to expoſe us in Print, tending to diſguſt Authority, and to bring more ſevere Perſecution upon us, as *ſeeming to be at Union with the Papiſtical party?* pretending to *diſcover Principles and Practices relating to* George Fox *and his Party* (as thou calleſt them) *that run parallel with the Church of* Rome. And then to excuſe this thy perſecuting *Cain*-like and *Judas*-like work againſt us, thou falſly placeſt it on the *Will of the Lord*, ſaying, *The Will of the Lord be done*, p. 17. (whilſt thou

thou art doing the Will of the Devil, thy Maſter and Father of Lyes and Lyars) adding, *That 'tis but juſt that Deceit and Idolatry ſhould be diſcovered in whomſoever, &c.* p. 18. But come on; *That thou doſt, do quickly.* Let's ſee what exact Similitudes and eminent Diſcoveries thou haſt ſhewn and made of our *ſeeming Union and Paralel with the Church of* Rome. Thus thou attempts it, *viz.*

1ſt, *'Tis affirmed of the Pope, that he is Chriſt's Vicar on Earth--Accounts himſelf inveſted with Power to execute outward Laws, Edicts and Decrees: Herein* (ſayſt thou) *I place not much difference between the Pope, on the one part, and the Pen-man and ſome of his the Brethren on the other.* And why ſo? *The Pen-man and his Brethren* (ſayſt thou) *account themſelves the* Repreſentatives *of Chriſt's inward Government over the Conſcience,* p. 18. That's an Untruth by the way, and none of our words, but a ſcornful Pervertion: Where did we ſo account our ſelves? 'Tis improper and unſound to ſay, *That viſible Men or finite Creatures are the* Repreſentatives *of Chriſts inward ſpiritual Government over the Conſcience*; which is endleſs, and where Chriſt himſelf reigns. Where did we ever aſſume a Government in Chriſt's ſtead over the Conſcience? But only as his Servants and Witneſſes, by his Spirit do commend

mend our ſelves to every mans Conſcience in the ſight of God, and thereby only repreſent or ſhew forth by ſound Doctrine and good Converſation, That Chriſt muſt rule and be obey'd as the Head of his Church; which vaſtly differs from the Pope's falſe ſence of his being *Chriſt's Vicar or Repreſentative on Earth.* Thou addeſt, *viz.* And *that they are inveſted with Power to execute outward Laws, Edicts and Decrees.* And what follows on thy diſcovery and ſimilitude? Therefore *the Pope and* G. F. *and his Party ſeem to be in Union, and run Paralel with the Church of* Rome: That's falſe. The true Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians had outward Laws, Commands, Decrees, *&c.* which they practiſed: So hath the Pope and the Church of *Rome* (though not the ſame.) What follows? Did they therefore ſeem to be in Union? Thy Similitude and Inference are fallacious. We differ in the Power and Manner of Execution; and our Laws and Decrees, which Chriſt hath given us, differ from the Popes. The Popes Power is Carnal and Coercive: Ours, Spiritual and Perſwaſive. The Popes Eccleſiaſtical Laws, Edicts, Canons and Decrees are to promote a falſe Church, Idolatrous Worſhip and Superſtition: Our Laws and Decrees, *&c.* are firſt written in our Hearts, and taught us by Chriſt Jeſus,

Jeſus, enjoyning us to eye, believe and follow him, as our Rock, our Way and Leader in Holineſs and Purity of Life and Converſation. Therefore thy Compariſon is ſilly and abuſive here, as well as Malicious: The Pope claims a ſucceſſion from *Peter* and *Peter*'s *Primacy*, * (as their term is) as the Rock and Foundation of the Church: So do not we, but deny that Doctrine as falſe, believing and owning Chriſt to be the Rock and Foundation; nor yet do we aſſume or pretend any Priviledge, Power or Authority over Chriſt's Church from an outward ſucceſſion, but only being Chriſt's Witneſſes, Miniſters, Servants and Ambaſſadours, are aſſiſted by his immediate Preſence, Power and Wiſdom with us, to aſſiſt, order and govern us in his ſervice, and the ſervice of one another in love.

* See *Rhe. Annotat.* fol. 572.

Again, thou proceedeſt in thy Similitudes, *viz.* 2dly, *The Pope likewiſe affirms, that the Church of* Rome *is the true Church, and in the true Faith: The* Romiſh *Clergy teach, that we muſt believe as the Church believes. Herein I cannot juſtly place much difference between the Popiſh Clergy and Pen-man, if he approved this Doctrine*; viz. "The true "Church is in the true Faith that is in God; "and we muſt either believe thus as the true "Church

"Church believes, or elſe it were but both "a Folly and Hypocriſie to profeſs our ſelves "Members thereof, *pag.* 18.

Thus thou wouldſt make me (whom I preſume thou intendeſt) to reſemble the Pope and his Clergy, and to ſeem to be in union with them: But doſt thou not own the Doctrine to be true in it ſelf, viz. *1ſt*, That the true Church is in the true Faith that is in God; And dareſt thou deny this? What ſayeſt thou to it? Speak out man, and be plain to the Point. *2dly*, That we muſt either believe THUS (*i. e* in God) as the true Church believes, or elſe 'twere Hypocriſie to profeſs our ſelves Members thereof. If thou canſt not deny the Doctrine in it ſelf, why haſt thou made this an Inſtance of our ſeeming to be in union with the *Popiſh* party? For thou knoweſt in thy Conſcience; *firſt*, That it was not ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*, but in general of *the true Church, whoſe Faith is* IN GOD, which we neither believe of the Church of *Rome*, nor does the Church of *Rome* believe ſo of us. Where's then our ſeeming Union? *ſecondly*, To believe in God as the true Church doth, herein the true Church is made an inſtance and example of Faith in God, not to make the Church's believing this or that, the ſole Reaſon and Cauſe of my (or our) believing the ſame, this were Implicit; 'tis *as*, not *becauſe*,

becauſe; for Chriſt, who is God, is the original & efficient cauſe both of the Church's and my *Faith*, which is in him, which is the one, living, ſubſtantial Faith, wherein is Unity. Whilſt thou canſt not confute the ſaid Doctrine, behold thy *Similitude*, what an empty FALSE SHEW it is: What real *Proteſtants* in *Europe* could eſcape thy Cenſure of Reſembling the Pope and his party (nay, how canſt thou eſcape thy ſelf) upon ſuch Fallacious Similitudes as thou haſt invented againſt us? The Pope and his party believe there there is a God, a Chriſt, a Heaven, a Hell, Immortality, future ſtates: So do all true *Proteſtants*. What follows according to thy Similitude? *Ergo*, all true *Proteſtants* ſeem to be at union with the Pope and his party. The Pope and his party believe there is one true Univerſal Church, and one true Faith: So do the *Proteſtants*, but not ſo of each other, they are not in Union; no more are we with the Pope or his party, but with the beſt Reformed *Proteſtants*, wherein they differ'd from, and oppos'd the Church of *Rome*. The Pope believes he is a true *Chriſtian*, and no Apoſtate: So doſt thou (*W. R.*) believe thou art a true *Chriſtian*, &c. What follows? *Ergo*, thou doſt Reſemble the Pope, and ſeemeſt to be at Union with the *Papiſtical* party: Is not this (*argumentum ad hominem*) like thy Similitudes?

tudes? and more reſembling them, than thou haſt reſembled *G. F.* and his party to the Pope and Church of *Rome*. How like a ſilly Sophiſter haſt thou argued? Mayeſt thou not bluſh and be aſhamed of ſuch silly Impertinent, yet abuſive Scribling, vain *Shews*, fallacious and abuſive Similitudes? But Truth has defaced thy Pictures and Images, and diſcovered thy empty *Shews* and Legerdemain Tricks, thy Pride and Scorn againſt the Innocent.

Thou proceedeſt in thy Similitudes, *viz.* 3dly, *The Popiſh Clergy think it not fit that the Laity ſhould undertake to treat on points of Divinity, or concern their heads with that, otherwiſe than to receive thoſe things in the ſence the Clergy teacheth. This beſpeaks little of any difference at all between the Pen-man and the Popiſh Clergy* (and why ſo?) *The Pen-man on the occaſion of my writing ſome-what touching Doctrine, thus ſaith, viz.* "This "man who is thus diſcompoſed in his work, "ſhould not have medled ſo much with "points of Divinity, which he appears ſo "little skilful in, p. 18.

What was thy deſign in this Inſtance, but to render the Pen-man and our ſecond days Meeting ſo far at unity with the *Popiſh Clergy*, as not to allow the Laity to treat on points of Divinity? Thou mightſt as well have ſaid, that we think not fit that any Laymen

men ſhould preach among us, which were notoriouſly falſe, and againſt our ſelves and Practice, and contrary to our conſtant Teſtimony, who are no *Clergy-men*, but *Laymen* * (ſo called.) Beſides, our ſaying, Thou ſhouldſt not have medled ſo much with points of Divinity, was not becauſe thou art one of the *Laity*, and not a *Clergy-man*, but becauſe of thy diſcompoſedneſs in thy work, and thy appearing ſo little skilful in ſome points of Divinity thou didſt medle in. See now how perverting and fallacious ſtill thou art in thy ſimilitudes.

* But I ſuppoſe he hath a reſerved and other ſence for his Diſtinction between *Clergy* and *Laity* here, than the common ſence and diſtinction: 'Tis ſome reflecting reſerve no doubt. He may tell his meaning in his next Book.

But to proceed on thy Fallacies, *viz.* 4thly, *Some have eſteemed the Authority of the Pope above the Authority of an Oecumenical or General Council, but ſome others the contrary; yet both have agreed, that the Authority accompanying the one of them, hath been the higheſt in the Church, from whence no appeal on Earth. In this I cannot of knowledge place much difference between my Adverſaries and the* Romiſh *Church, becauſe* I know not *but that* G. F. *may be by ſome declared to be inveſted with a greater Authority than the General Meeting; neither can I deny, but that the*

the General Meeting may be by others eſteemed to be inveſted with greater Authority than he, p. 19.

See now, what amounts thy Similitude unto here? *Thou canſt not of knowledge place much difference, &c.* becauſe *thou knoweſt not but that* G. F. MAY BE *by ſome ſo declared, &c.* Inſtead of ſhewing Reſemblance or a Similitude and ſeeming Union between us and the Romiſh Church, now thy proof is come to [*I KNOW NOT BUT, &c.*] and to a [*G. F. MAY BE, &c.*] And then again, thou *canſt not deny but that the General Meeting may be by others eſteemed, &c.* as before. So thy *May-be's* are thy Diſcoveries before pretended: See thy impertinent trifling. But thou knoweſt, that the Authority and Power of our Meetings has been frequently declared to be the Power of God, which is the ſame in all Meetings of his faithful People: We place not the Authority upon any Meeting or Number of Perſons, meerly as a Meeting, but upon the Preſence and Power of Chriſt in that Meeting; for he is our great and wonderful Counſellor.

§. 6. 5thly, What *Cry for Juſtice* is it thou complaineſt *hath not been hearkned unto in* London, *when relating to* G. F? Was it a Cry for thee to be heard againſt *G. F.* in his preſence or abſence? or was it Juſtice for

for thee to be heard read the Papers or Indictments againſt him, when he was many Miles diſtant? It ſeems thou art for Judgment againſt *G. F.* but who muſt be the Judges, and where the Judicature? Not thy ſelf and Party, for ye are a party extream againſt him; not thoſe thou haſt judged Apoſtates and of party with *G. F.* for they are incompetent (in thy own account) for thee to appeal to; not the World, for they are unmeet to judge of ſpiritual differences; for the Saints ſhall judge the World. If thou ſayſt, *'Tis the Church of Chriſt thou wouldſt appeal to for Juſtice againſt* G. F. this grants the Church a Power of Judgment and Determination in matters relating to Conſcience, contrary to thy own Principle and Doctrine. And then, where is that Church of Chriſt thou wouldſt appeal unto, that is neither of thy party, nor of *G. F*'s? Now conſider where thou art run. And why doſt thou go on with thy jealous Reflections upon the Pen-man, when thou canſt neither write poſitively, nor haſt proof againſt him, ſaying, *It is well if the endeavours of the Pen-man (who peradventure may expect advance by Uſurpation in the Government contended for) be not as great to keep off the ſtroke of Juſtice, when as relating to* G. F. *as Cardinal* Scomberges *were to keep off the Reformation from the Court of Rome*, &c. p. 19.

What

What proof is all this againſt the Penman, but to expoſe thy Malice and dubious (as well as proofleſs) Reflections to open cenſure? Inſtead of Proof, thou preſents us with thy [*If*] and with thy [*Peradventure*] Whereas the Pen-man can appeal to the righteous Judge of all and Heart-ſearcher, againſt thy Defaming and falſe Inſinuation of *expecting advancement by Uſurpation in Government, keeping off the ſtroke of Juſtice*; both which my Scul loaths. As an humble Subject under Chriſt's Government, I only oppoſe the ſtroke of the envious revengeful Spirit in thee and other Apoſtates, &c. as I really judge it my Duty.

5*thly*, And what if it *be reputed, That* G. F. *originally called Miniſtring Friends to General Meetings Yearly?* (or was Inſtrumental therein) as thou ſayeſt, p. 20. Doth this *ſeem to have union with the Popes calling General Councils conſiſting of the Clergy?* Did not the Primitive Apoſtles and Elders ſometimes aſſemble, and that long before there were Popes or their Councils? Were they therefore to be compared to the Popes and their General Councils? Our placing the Ground of the Controverſie on *an oppoſite dark Spirit* on thy and thy Abettors part, is true; and ſo it is alſo, that thy oppoſition to many Faithful Servants of Chriſt, was the Fruit of Darkneſs, and no juſt compariſon,

comparison with the *Bishop of* Bitonto's *commendation of Pope* Paul *the third*, nor with his *exhorting all to submit to that Council, which if they do not, it will be justly said, the Popes Light is come into the World, and men love Darkness better than Light*, (as thou cites him in this blasphemous Doctrine) and to add to this Unjust and Impertinent Instance or Similitude, thou insinuatest by Query, *Whether that Expression may be a proper Looking-glass for the Pen-man and* G. Fox, *to see their Faces in, when they conclude it the Fruit of Darkness not to submit to their Councils and outward Directories? I shall leave to the consideration of the unprejudiced understanding Reader.* [Thus far thou] p. 20.

What expression a Proper Looking-Glass? The Bishop's saying, *The Popes Light is come into the World, and men love Darkness better than Light*? Is this thy proper Looking-Glass to see our Faces in? 'Tis but a dull one. Where did we ever in all our Councils, Expressions or outward Directories (as thou calleſt them) so much as resemble such false Doctrine and Blasphemy? No, we abhor it. What a false Looking-Glass hast thou presented here? It serves only to shew how Evil and False thy Eye is, and how bad thy Sight is; how Impertinently and Sordidly hast thou cast upon many Servants of Christ those accounts against

Popes, &c. which thou haſt gathered out of the Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent?* And how eaſie is it to make Books at that rate? Thou haſt known better things of the Miniſters of Chriſt's Light among us, than thus to repreſent them with thy falſe Similitudes; and mayeſt remember, that our frequent Teſtimony has been (as ſtill it is) to excite People to Chriſt's Light within, as being *that true Light which is come into the World*, and to his Counſel that proceeds from his Light; and not to the Pope nor any of his Councils. And thy pretended Godly Jealouſie, *That* G. F. *hath been endeavouring to exhalt his own Imaginations inſtead of Chriſt's Light*, appears Ungodly and Falſe, as many more of thy Jealouſies (which are no Proofs) do.

§. 7. And now thy Similitudes of Diſunion or difference between the *Pope* and *G. F.* and his Friends, p. 21, 22. to render him and them worſe than the Pope, are as ſcornful and wicked as thy former; as for inſtance, to thy ſaying, *The Pope publiſheth his Bull or Decree in his Name; and doth not uſually ſay, 'tis not for want of freeneſs in Spirit that I deſire my Name ſhould be hid: But it appears to me that the Pen-man was* ASHAMED *that his Name ſhould be publiſht with the great Bull, entituled, The Accuſer of the Brethren caſt down.* [Thus thou] where-

in

in thon haſt told a groſs Perverſion and Untruth; for the Pen-man neither ſaid, *I deſire my Name ſhould be hid*, nor yet was he ASHAMED that his Name ſhould be publiſht with that Book thou falſly and ſcornfully calleſt, *The Great Bull*; nor doth he or any others concern'd therein, find any Cauſe to be aſhamed thereof, but to ſtand by it againſt thy Malice and Abuſes in thy *Great Bull*, as it may be rather term'd, for thy attempting therein to Unchriſtian and Unchurch a great number of faithful Servants of Chriſt.

Again, the Reaſon thou giveſt, why thy *Adverſaries* (as thou calleſt us) *have not puniſht thy Body, nor taken away any of thy Eſtate, is, But bleſſed be the Lord, they have no Power ſo to do.* Herein thou accounteſt is *ſome little* difference between them (thou ſmites at) and *the Lords Inquiſitors of the* Popiſh *Inquiſition*, p. 21. I muſt tell thee, I think this a very Uncharitable cenſure and ſmiting, implying that *they would both puniſh thy Body, and take away thy Eſtate, and ſo be as bad as the Lords of the* Spaniſh *Inquiſition, if they had but Power ſo to do.* Which beſpeaks great Prejudice and Darkneſs to have entred thee. And then, to aggravate the matter, thou turneſt it about again, That *they* (*i. e.* thy Adverſaries) *have not ſuffered thee to ſee the Faces or know the Names of*

thy Judges: In that reſpect (ſayſt thou) *the Lords of the* Spaniſh *Inquiſition have been more juſt*, p. 21.

How odiouſly and groſly haſt thou here repreſented thy Oppoſers, who have not divulg'd their Names againſt thee, of whom I take the Pen-man (and thee to mean my ſelf) to be one; And if ſo, I muſt tell thee, thou haſt inſinuated a groſs Slander, to render the Lords of the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition more juſt; and by a Lye juſtifieſt the *Papiſts*, who clap men up in Priſon all their dayes, never letting them know their Accuſers; (ſee the *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*) for though the name of the Writer was not divulged with that Treatiſe entituled, *The Accuſer*, &c. Many others have given their Names in the ſame judgment concerning thee and thy work of Diſcord and Enmity, and many more alſo do own and ſtand by that Judgment and Treatiſe: And I muſt farther tell thee in the ſight of God, I ſee no cauſe to retract, but to ſtand by that Treatiſe, and own my ſhare in it, notwithſtanding thy oppoſition to the contrary, picking, and nibbling, and quarrelling here and there, but giving the *GO-BY* to the moſt material parts thereof, wherein the Controverſie is moſt fully opened and diſtinguiſhed.

Of

Of thoſe Popes with whom W. R. *compares our Friends.*

§. 8. Seeing *W.R.* eſteems the *Popes*, (yea, even the worſt of them) good enough to bring us in compariſon with, and to cite and make them as Inſtances againſt us, As,

Pope Leo *the Tenth*, p. 6, & 22.
Pope Paul *the Third*, p. 19, & 28.
Pope Julius *the Third*, p. 31.

It may not be amiſs to give ſome deſcription of theſe Popes, according to a late *Hiſtory* or *Abſtract of the Lives of the Popes*, printed Anno 1679.

Among the Atheiſts

"*Leo the Tenth* is ranked, who hearing "Cardinal *Bembo* ſpeaking to a point con- "cerning the joyful Meſſage of our Lord, "anſwered moſt diſſolutely, *It is well known "to the World, through all Ages, in how great "ſtead that Fable of Chriſt hath profitted us "and our Aſſociates.* This man neither be- "lieved *Heaven* nor *Hell* after our departure "out of this Life. And ſuch were *Alex- "ander* the 10th, *Sylveſter* the 2d, *PAUL* "the 3d, *Benedict* the 19th, *John* the 13th, "*Clement* the 7th and *Gregory* the 7th.

Among the Magicians & Conjurers

" *Paul the Third* is ranked, as having ob-
" tained the Garland in Aſtrology, and in
" that kind of Speculation which is aſſiſted
" by the Miniſtry of Devils. He altogether
" kept familiar Acquaintance with *Negro-*
" *mancers*, and ſuch like Impoſters, *&c.*

Among Warriours & Blood-ſuckers.

" *Paul the Third* was alſo accounted, *viz.*
" A great Perſecutor of the Saints of God,
" raiſed and fomented the *German* War,
" which proved the Deſtruction of many
" thouſand Families.

Among Paricides & Impoyſoners.

" *Paul the Third* alſo impoiſoned his Mo-
" ther and Niece, that the whole Inheri-
" tance of the *Farnieſian* Family might
" accrew to himſelf. His other Siſter alſo,
" whom he carnally knew upon fancying
" her freeneſs to others, he ſlew by Poyſon.
" And ſo he is recorded among Inceſtuous
" Perſons alſo.

Among

Among the Favourites of Whores.

"Its ſaid, That *Paul the Third* kept a "Roll of forty five Thouſand *Whores*, who "paid him a Monethly Tribute.

Among Sodomites.

"*Julius the Third* uſed one *Innocent* as his "Minion, and created him Cardinal. Of whom this account is alſo given (in *Dr. Gilb. Burnet's Hiſtory of Reformation, Book* 2. *Abridgment*, pag. 121.) *viz.* "That Pope "*Julius the Third* (when Cardinal *Pool* was "rejected for his being too good) was choſen "for his Badneſs, who gave his place of Car- "dinal to his man that kept his Munkey, "ſaying, *He ſaw as much in his Man to make "him Cardinal, as the Cardinals ſaw in him "to make him Pope.*

Query, *What worſe Perſons upon Earth could our Adverſary have compared* G. F. *and Friends unto, or brought in Compariſon againſt them in Church Proceedings or Spiritual Cenſures? Behold his* horrid Injuſtice *and* Envy!

CHAP. III.

§. 1. W. R's *Accuſation of endavouring to take away his Credit: Next, to depriving him of his Eſtate, examined; and the juſtneſs of our dealing with him, vindicated. What ſore Reflection he has brought upon himſelf by his Complaint, and his acting the part of a* Perſecuting Informer, *to render his antient Friends call'd* Quakers, *Obnoxious in the Eye of the Law and Authority.* §. 2. *His bitterly Inveighing againſt* C. Marſhall *and many other Brethren. His unjuſt Inſtance of Pope* Leo's *Bull again. His and* F. Bugg's *Contradiction about* W. Penn. *Schiſm condemned in and by the Church of Chriſt, as well as Heretical Doctrine and Scandalous Living. The decreaſe of* W. R's *Number, and the increaſe and gathering of many faithful to Chriſt and us his followers, foretold.* §. 3. *The Pen-man's writing in behalf and in the name of the peaceable People called* Quakers, *vindicated from* W. R's *ſevere and ſeditious Inferences.* §. 4. *W. R. called in queſtion upon his own Principle, for writing in the name and behalf of (and repreſenting) divers Perſons, who never choſe nor gave him Power, nor allowed him ſo to do (and his abuſe*

abuſe of E. Burroughs *and* I. Pennington) *whereupon his ſevere Charge and Inference is all returned upon his own head.* §. 5. W. R. *and* F. Bugg, *their Reflections upon the Meeting in the Iſle of* Ely, *no proof of Friends Apoſtacy, but of their own Partiality and Injuſtice in their Repreſentation of the matter.* §. 6. W. R.'s *again recited Lye about the Paper from* Barbadoes, *as being* one part of the fruits of the pretended eſtabliſht Government, *with other unjuſt Aggravations thereupon, farther detected.*

§. 1. TO prove *that thy Adverſaries would cauſe thee to ſuffer in Body and Eſtate, if they had Power*; thou ſayſt, *They have endeavoured, as much as in them lies, to take away thy Credit, which is next to depriving thee of thy Eſtate.* And wherein to take away thy Credit? Thou ſayeſt, *The Penman hath given thee this ſort of Treatment, either in relation to thy ſelf or thy Book*, viz. "Helliſh Jealouſies, Fiery Agent "& Incendiary, his Heart is filled "with Pride and Envy. As for "William Rogers's Book againſt "Church Government, 'tis outra-"giouſly Wicked, Clamorous and "Abuſive. *I cannot ſuppoſe*, (ſayſt thou) *what*

what he means by theſe his very words "[He is "here treated far more mildly than his "work deſerves] *unleſs he believes that my work deſerves corporal Puniſhment, or Confiſcation of Eſtate. I cannot but again ſay, Bleſſed be the Lord, that the Rigid Uncharitable Pen-man hath not Power ſo to do.* [Thus far thou] p. 21, 22.

To all which I ſay, and that in the ſight of the Righteous God, who is Judge of all, that I know no Treatment given thee, in theſe and the like Paſſages in our Book, than what thou and thine juſtly deſerve, though in much elſe of ours thou art treated far more mildly, yea, more kindly than thy work deſerves. And doſt thou indeed judge, that we have endeavoured to take away thy Credit by ſuch kind of Treatment? And that 'tis next to taking away thy Eſtate? What haſt THOU then done againſt us; yea, againſt many of the peaceable People called *Quakers?* Haſt not rendred us *Unchriſtian*, in *notorious Blaſphemy*, *Apoſtates*, *Innovators*, *Impoſers of blind Obedience*, *Popiſh*, *Papiſtical Track*, *in Union with the Pope and his Party*, *more unjuſt than the Lords of the* Spaniſh *Inquiſition* (Yea, and at ſuch a time as this, when I preſume thou canſt not be ignorant, how that many of our Innocent Friends are under ſevere proſecution and ſuffering, both in their Perſons and

and Eſtates) *by Laws made in the reign of* Q. Elizabeth *and* K. James? How Uncharitable and Unjuſt? How perſecuting Informer-like (all circumſtances conſidered) is thy Treatment? And how Inhumane, tending to add to theſe our Afflictions? And yet complaineſt of our Endeavours to take away thy Credit, and conſequently thy Eſtate, when thou art but juſtly reprehended, and no other Characters placed on thy Work and Envious Spirit, than what are juſt, and naturally belong thereunto. Hath it not been our practice from the beginning, to teſtifie againſt our Perſecutors, and to reprove their Envy and Cruelty? Did we therein go about to bring corporal Puniſhment and Confiſcation of Eſtate upon them? No ſure. Canſt thou take liberty to abuſe and villifie ſo many Servants of Chriſt in Print, and think they muſt all be mute under thy Abuſes, and none to reprehend thee? No ſuch matter. They that have but the leaſt ſpark of holy Zeal, or but any Life or Soul for God, muſt needs be kindled in ſome meaſure againſt thy abominable Abuſes and Injurious perſecuting Work. It ſeems, thou valueſt thy own Credit and Eſtate at a high rate above others: Thou ſeemeſt little to value the Credit, Liberty or Eſtates of many others, (even of thy antient Friends, called *Quakers*) to brand and ſtigmatize them

them, as thou haſt done, with as Infamous Characters, yea, and as Obnoxious in the Eye of Law and Authority, as thou eaſily canſt, and yet complaineſt of Endeavours to deſtroy thy Credit and Eſtate, when thou haſt given the firſt occaſion of the Reprehenſion and Judgment given upon thee and thy work of Malice. Thou haſt begun the Fray publickly, and broke the Peace; now complaineſt of *Uncharitable Treatment.* Firſt thou art Barking, Snapping and Biting, then art Complaining and Whyning, when a little Whipt for thy Folly, thy Pieviſh and Ugly Behaviour. Oh! Injurious and Partial Man! Haſt thou done as thou wouldſt be done by? For ſhame give over thy malicious and fruitleſs Attempts.

§. 2. Again, 'tis obſervable how bitterly thou ſtill inveighs againſt *Charles Marſhall* and the Sixty five Perſons more, about the Paper touching *J. W.* and *J. S.* as judging it *In ſome reſpect to be much like the Bull given forth by Pope* Leo *the Tenth, againſt* Martin Luther, *Anno* 1520. *But yet in one main Point greatly differs; for* (ſayeſt thou) *in the Bull there are Forty two Articles of Doctrine condemned, and the Bull ordered to be read in every place, that the matters for which he was proſecuted as an Heretick might be known. But*

in

in the aforeſaid Paper, ſubſcribed by Charles Marſhall, *&c. There is no mention of any particular Doctrine, or Vitiouſneſs of Life, for which they are perſecuted by their Brethren,* p. 22. [Thus far thou.]

Whence three things are to be obſerved, 1*ſt*, That the ſaid Paper is compared to the Pope's Bull, as much like it in ſome reſpect: 2*dly*, That its deem'd worſe than the Pope's Bull, in not mentioning any particular Doctrine or Vitious Life againſt *J. W.* and *J. S.* 3*dly*, That they who ſubſcribed the ſaid Paper, were perſecutors of their Brethren. Whereof thou knoweſt *William Penn* was one: How foully haſt thou aſperſt and repreſented *C. M.* and *W. P.* &c. in theſe things? And how do theſe Compariſons againſt him, and thy rendring him a Perſecutor of his Brethren, agree with his being *Dear W. P. This Noble man*, &c? as thy Brother *F. Bugg*, and conſequently thy ſelf, have rendred him, being in thy Book, pag. 73. 74.

As for their not mentioning any particular Doctrine or Vitious Life, that others might know the matters alledged againſt them; what, wouldſt infer that therefore the Pope's Bull againſt *M. Luther* was more reaſonable or juſt? That's a miſtake, for thou confeſſeſt a Judgment to be given againſt that *jealous, rending and ſeparate Spirit* from

from which thou haſt not cleared them (but rendred them the more Guilty, if thou beeſt their Repreſentatives, as impowered by them to write in their Vindication, according to thy own reflection on us.) And was that no Reaſon then to give others notice and warning againſt ſuch a Spirit? Is *Schiſm* no Sin, or not reproveable? But how Unjuſt is thy Compariſon? I ask thee, if thou dareſt ſay, that Pope *Leo* (that *Atheiſt*) was in the ſame Senſe, Religion, Gravity and tender Exerciſe toward *M. Luther*, that in thy own Narrative thou haſt rendred theſe Friends in, that were concern'd in dealing with *J. S.* and *J. W.* at *Drawell*? And I ask thee further, If ever thou readſt any ſuch Acknowledgment, Submiſſion or Condemnation made by *Martin Luther* to the Church of *Rome*, as the ſaid *J. S.* and *J. W.* with thy own aſſiſtance, made as ſatisfaction to their Brethren, and the Church of God in general? Though afterward thou compareſt it to a Rattle to pleaſe Children. And hath a *Chriſtian* Society no Power to reprove and judge a dividing, ſelf-ſeparating Spirit, (in whomſoever it be) that makes Rents and Schiſms, as well as Heretical Doctrine, and Vitious or Scandalous living? *Mark them that cauſe Diviſions and Offences, and avoid them*, &c. If thou granteſt the Principle, and ſuch power

power in a *Christian* Society or Church, what will thy attempts to Unchristian and Unchurch us avail, unless thou canst prove us guilty of Vitious Lives and Heretical Doctrine? Which if thou canst not, then hast thou and thy party assumed a Power to judge of Spirits, wherein you fairly give away your Cause, and overthrow much of your own opposition to the Churches Power and Determination in such cases? And your Judgment to Unchristian us or our Spirits, being but your Imposition, we shall as little value; and the day will yet farther discover whose Spirits are Unchristian, and whose Spirits are Christian. And 'tis not thy boasting either of the Numerousness or Scores (of thy party) p. 23. that will decide the Controversie; nor wouldst thou accept of such a Plea on our parts, but doubtless esteem it no *Christian* Proof or Argument, but an Imposition, and begging the Question: But seeing thou layest so much stress on thy Numbers and Scores, I must tell thee, that if they amounted to as many as the third part of the Stars (which yet they are far short of) that followed thee, or owned thy Work of opposition & strife, they would be but wandring Stars, and have lost their Habitations and Glory, and are darkned, whom the Dragon's Tayl has drawn and cast down to the Earth. But blessed be

the

the Lord our God, the greater part of the Stars, among us his People called *Quakers*, have kept their Station and Splendor in the Firmament of his Power, and in living Union, Concord and Love, wherein they live above that Spirit of Enmity and Diſcord which thou and thy party are in, and which the Lord will yet farther diſcover and deliver thoſe who are at unawares betrayed thereby, yet have ſome ſecret Breathings unto him, and that they may come into clearneſs of Judgment, ſo as on the Reſtoration and increaſe of the number of the Faithful and Upright: And by the ſpreading of the Goſpel day, thy Numbers ſhall decreaſe; and many will come to ſee thee more and more in thy dark and miſchievous attempts, and how inſuccesful and diſappointed thou wilt be therein. And thoſe that come to be recovered, and many Thouſands that ſhall be gathered to the Lord and us his People, ſhall be found better, and more worthy, than thy ſelf, and thoſe that go out and ſeparate from us.

§. 3. *W. R.* is pleaſed to make a Charge, and draw ſevere and ſeditious Inferences upon our *Advertiſement*, and concluſion of our *Introduction*, eſpecially againſt the Penman, for vindicating *the People called Quakers* in their Church-Order and Diſcipline,

and

and writing in the Name of the People called Quakers, when vindicated from his Scandals. But he has very unfairly and diſ-ingenuouſly left out the diſtinguiſhing expreſſions in the firſt, as [*Peaceable, Chriſtian, Conſcientiouſly, Chriſtian Society*, p. 23.] in the paſſage of ours, *viz.* We the peaceable *Chriſtian* People called *Quakers* are Conſcientiouſly vindicated and cleared in our *Chriſtian* Society. Where's then his exception againſt our vindication and writing in the *Plural*, in the Name of the peaceable People called *Quakers*? But that, 1. *We could not write in the Name of ſuch as encouraged the publication of his Treatiſe entituled, The Chriſtian-Quaker, in five parts, who yet are a part of the People called Quakers.* (ſaith he) 2. *Nor in the Names of ſuch as are diſaffected with laying Marriages before Womens Meetings*; *And theſe are numerous, and called Quakers* (quoth he.) To the *firſt*; Anſwer, No: How ſhould we write in their Names, who encouraged the Publication of his ſaid Treatiſe againſt us (if any ſuch were, for they keep very obſcure, as not willing to be known in ſuch encouragement.) It is a Book of Envy, Strife and Diſcord, and they no *Peaceable Quakers* who encouraged it. 'Twas *the Peaceable People called Quakers* that were concerned in our Vindication: And therefore *W. R.*

ſaith true, as't happens; *The Pen-man could not write in the Name of ſuch as encouraged the Publication of his Book.* Whence it follows, they were not of that Peaceable ſort which he vindicated, nor *W. R*'s Book a work of Peace, or in the leaſt tending thereto, but a great Abuſe and Scandal to, and againſt the very peaceable People called *Quakers*. *Secondly*; Nor are they who oppoſe our Godly Women's Meetings, and laying Marriages before them, ſo peaceable and clear in their minds (in that point) as we could wiſh they were, and they ſhould be better informed, and hear Inſtruction: However, they alſo are concluded by *W. R*'s words, not to be of that *Peaceable* People called *Quakers* intended in our Vindication, in that he ſaith, *The Pen-man cannot be underſtood to write in their Names*; when 'tis moſt evident he did write in the Name of *The Peaceable Chriſtian People called Quakers.* Though *W. R.* as one in ſome wiſe Conſcious, leaves out the word [*Peaceable*] that he might with the greater colour draw his Charge and ſevere Inferences upon the Pen-man, &c. But ſuch kind of ſlighty mean ſhifts will ſtand him in no ſtead, when we ſtrictly look into his Fallacious dealing.

And granting him that we cannot repreſent (nor be underſtood to write in the Name of) ſuch *Quakers* (ſo called) as encouraged

couraged the publication of his perſecuting Books and Pamphlets againſt us, nor of ſuch as either oppoſe our Womens Meetings, or laying Marriages before them, or are diſaffected there-with, nor in the Names of *the ſeveral Scores* he tells of, *who gave Teſtimony in Writing againſt* Charles Marſhall *and ſixty five more.* (The greateſt part whereof being known to be Faithful men of Sincerity and ſervice in the Lord's work) Nor in the Names of ſuch as he ſaith *appear Neutral in the preſent Controverſie, and yet own the ſame Principles which he and his party do.* Where is then their Neutrallity? is it in having *no concern of Conſcience outwarly to appear on either party*, as *W. R.* ſaith? Then they are only Neutrals in appearance, but ſecretly of his party and Principles, ſome whereof are very perverſe and unpeaceable, as well as unſound. Now I ſay, we grant that we of the Second day's Meeting did not repreſent ſuch kind of *Quakers* as thoſe of *W. R.* his party; nor could they impower us in our writing for, and repreſenting the *peaceable People called Quakers*, or that peaceable ſort of *Quakers*, who are for Unity, Love, Concord and Peace in the Church of Chriſt among us, nor was it our intention to repreſent, perſonate or vindicate ſuch pretended *Quakers*, as are in a Spirit of diſcord and ſtrife, cauſing and

making Diviſions, Rents and Schiſmes in the Church (firſt diſturbing and troubling, then reproaching the Society they ſometime owned) but only thoſe of a peaceable Mind and Spirit; and therefore *his not knowing that we can repreſent any under that Name, more than our own Second day's Meeting*, is a falſe inſinuation; for there are many Thouſands of the People called *Quakers*, yea, of the moſt ſincere and peaceable minded, beſides our ſaid Meeting, whoſe real ſenſe and judgment (in the matters treated on in our Book, againſt *W. R*'s great Book) we have repreſented, and who really do and will own the ſame. Where now hath *W. R.* ſhown *the Pen-man guilty of great Impudence*, in writing in behalf of the peaceable People called *Quakers*? The word *Peaceable* in our *Advertiſement*, left out by him, doth really diſtinguiſh it, with reſpect only to *the peaceable ſort*, which are they that live in Love and Unity, who may properly be termed *The* PEOPLE *called Quakers*, as united in one Society, and become one People, and not dividing ſeparate Spirits, who are gone out from us. And though in our *Introduction*, we ſay the terms *We* and *Us* are uſed, *ſometimes in the Name of the People called* Quakers, *when vindicated from his Scandals*. I ſay ſo ſtill. And this intends no other than the *Peaceable People*,

(as

(as before explain'd in our *Advertiſement*) and not any ſuch pretended *Quakers*, as *W. R.* his party and Abettors, who are unpeaceable and turbulent to the Society and People among whom they ſometime walked. And therefore his roaring and clamouring out *great Impudence, Pride, and height of ſuch towring lofty ſpirited Perſons as the Pen-man*, &c. are but empty Clamours and Abuſes, as is alſo his Jealouſie, *That the Pen-man counts himſelf one of the Repreſentatives of Chriſt's inward Government*, who alone is Lord over the Conſcience. Whereas the Pen-man never ſo accounted of himſelf, nor ever aſſumed to himſelf any ſuch Government or Lordſhip over the Conſcience, as is peculiar to Chriſt alone; but only accounts himſelf a Servant of Chriſt, and a Subject under his *ſpiritual* Government: And therefore *W. R*'s ſtill proceeding in his roaring and bitter Exclamation againſt him, as *That he would repreſent in Print, as if the People called* Quakers, *without reſtriction* (a Lye ſtill) *were Perſons impowering ſuch an imperious Map of Pride and Drollery, as the Pen-man ſhews himſelf to write in their Names.* The matter is anſwered before; but yet I may further add, as the Envy and Malice of this Adverſary appears ſwelling high, ſo his confidently repeated Falſhoods and Abuſes are numerous;

rous; for we would neither ſo repreſent in Print, nor yet did the Pen-man ſo much as pretend to be *impowered to write by that People in general, or without reſtriction*; and yet both in Charity and Chriſtian duty, might vindicate all them as the *peaceable* People ca'ed *Quakers*, who are really *peaceable* in their Spirits and Converſations: And though there be ſome called *Quakers*, who are unpeaceable in both ſuch as *W. R.* and his party; yet that cannot unpeople the other, who are truly peaceable, but rather unpeople themſelves, who are unpeaceable, from being of that People: Such our vindication of a peaceable People from the unpeaceable, proves none of us Impudent, nor any *imperious Map of Pride and Drollery, notorious Falſhood, &c.* as moſt unjuſtly rendred by an imperious proud Adverſary. For hath it not been frequent with us, to vindicate the People called *Quakers*? intending all thoſe that might properly be counted a People in Peace and Unity, and that from the general Aſperſions and Calumnies, both of open and ſecret Enemies: And in this Controverſie we vindicate them as that peaceable People, who are ſincere and faithful to God, lovers of Peace, Unity and good Order, and whom *W. R.* and his party, in their dividing and perverſe gain-ſayings, are not able to unpeople, nor juſtly to ren-

der

der themſelves that People. As for him and thoſe of his party, who promote his malicious, perſecuting, defaming Books, *&c.* We cannot look upon them worthy to bear ſo much as the Name *Quakers*, much-leſs to be deemed that People under the Title of *Chriſtian-Quakers*, whilſt in their Unchriſtian ſpirit of ſtrife and diſcord: And they will yet more manifeſt themſelves to be further remote from that peaceable People called *Quakers*, if they Repent not; and the peaceable and faithful, who love unity and peace in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ſhall remain a people, and live when all ſuch ſpirits as luſt to envy and contention, ſhall be confounded, ſcattered, wither, be driven back and come to naught in their evil Deſigns and wicked Attempts; the Breath of the Lord ſhall ſcatter them; *for no Weapon formed againſt his Heritage ſhall proſper.*

But alas! our Adverſary is ſtill in a great fude and fret for our writing in behalf, or in the name of the People called *Quakers*, (reiterating his Falſhood again) *without Reſtriction*, p. 24, 25. he ſhould have ſaid, *Peaceable People called Quakers.* But he goes on at an outragious rate on this ſubject, confeſſing, *He wants words to repreſent the Action in as ugly a dreſs as it deſerves.* And therefore when he hath as falſly aſperſt the

Pen-man, and ſet him out in as *Ugly a Dreſs* as he can (ſo that the *Devil* and *William Rogers* have done their worſt hitherto) he ſuppoſeth a Compariſon in the caſe againſt him, but very unjuſtly in theſe words, *viz.*

Suppoſe a company of men, never choſen according to Law, ſhould meet at Weſtminſter, *and call themſelves the* Repreſentatives of the People of England, *and accordingly in the Name of the People of* England *proceed to act as ſuch: Wouldſt thou not abhor and deteſt the Action? And how canſt thou think that we can do leſs than deteſt thy inſolent Spirit, by offering to write in the Name of the People called* Quakers, *without Reſtriction, when they gave neither thee nor any of thy Brethren ſuch Authority? Had the fear of God been before thine Eyes, thou couldſt not have attempted to have done ſo Wickedly*, p. 25.

Here it is probable he thinks, he hath given the *Pen-man* a deadly Blow; but when the *Devil* and *William Rogers* have done their worſt, it comes to little Execution, but to manifeſt his Envy and Folly. He only ſhews his Teeth, but cannot bite nor faſten; for there is no juſt paralel in the caſe; there is no ſuch kind of Treaſonable proceeding juſtly chargeable upon the *Pen-man*, as is inferred in the Compariſon: The Pen-man did not call himſelf the *Repreſentative*, nor write in the Name of the People

People (or of all thoſe) called *Quakers*, without Reſtriction, as he falſly ſaith, nor pretend an Election or Authority from them ſo to do; the matter is diſtinguiſhed and anſwered before, and yet the Pen-man might lawfully repreſent the Innocency of all true peaceable *Quakers*, both as to Principle and Practice, when abuſed and calumniated, either as *Unchriſtian* or *Popiſh Impoſers, &c. without Conviction* (like as this Adverſary hath frequently miſrepreſented them) And this may be done charitably, freely and voluntarily in their Name and Vindication, and in true Unity, from a right knowledge of their Innocency, declared Senſe and Principles; And hath not this been the Practice of many faithful Servants of Chriſt among us, ever ſince we were a People, to write both in the name & vindication of the People of *God* called *Quakers*, or of the *Innocent People* called *Quakers*, &c. as the Lord hath laid a neceſſity upon them, and yet not to include thoſe who are unfaithful or ſcandalous to Truth, or any who are turned into Envy and Strife, though they go under that Name? Nor yet have they ſought or needed to ſeek Commiſſion from the whole People, to write in their behalf, being required of the Lord to write. And did not many of the beſt reformed Proteſtants and Martyrs write in the name

and

and behalf of the Proteſtant Church and Religion, as the Book of Martyrs and other Hiſtories, and their own Writings ſhew; of which numerous Inſtances might be given. And did not the the Apoſtles of Chriſt often write in the *Plural*, both in the name and behalf of themſelves and the reſt of true Believers and Fellow-members, under the terms, *We*, and *Us*, and *Our*, &c. eſpecially in that of 1 *John* 2. 19. *They went out from* Us, *but they were not of* Us; *for if they had been of* Us, *they would no doubt have continued with* Us; ſee chap. 3. 14. and 4. 6. Here *John* wrote in the Name of his Brethren and Fellow-members, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves from thoſe that went out from them, as we have our ſelves, as a peaceable People, from you that are gone out from us, into a *Spirit of Enmity*, *Diſcord* and *Self-ſeparation*.

§. 4. But (*W. R.*) ſince thou counteſt it ſuch a *horrid Crime*, ſuch *great Impudence*, *Pride*, *ugly Action*, *Inſolence*, *&c.* to write in the name or on the behalf of People or Perſons, or in their Vindication, without being impowered, authorized and choſen by the ſame Perſons or People. Now obſerve well upon thy own principle and way of arguing, what a Reckoning I have with thee: Let us ſeriouſly enquire of thee,

Have

Have all thoſe Perſons in whoſe behalf and Name thou haſt written in the *Plural* (under the Terms *We, Us, &c.*) given thee Authority, or choſen thee to write in their Name and behalf? Did *John Story*, *John Wilkinſon*, and now the perſon in *Cambridgſhire* (whom thou and *Francis Bugg* contend for, againſt the Record about his Marriage) all give thee Authority (or chuſe thee) to write on their behalf, and to expoſe their Names in Print, as thou haſt done in thy ſtate of the Controverſie on their behalf? Did they give thee Authority to write in their names and behalf, as thoſe *Other Friends in Truth* thou telleſt of and repreſenteſt? Either they did, or they did not; if they did, then they may be entituled to, and are juſtly chargeable with thy work, how perverſe and abuſive ſoever it be; If they did not chuſe nor authorize thee to write in their behalf and name, then thy own Judgment returns upon thy own head, as *one guilty of great Impudence, Pride, towring lofty Spirit, notorious Falſhood, ugly Dreſs, &c.* to write in the name and vindication of Perſons, and to repreſent them who never gave thee Power, nor choſe thee to thy work. Didſt not thou pretend to write *on behalf of thy ſelf, and other Friends in Truth concerned*, as in the Title-page of thy great Book? and now to uſe the words

Us,

Us, *We* or *Our*, with reſpect to ſuch as encouraged the giving forth thereof, as in thy Advertiſement to thy ſeventh part? When now divers noted Perſons, who have appeared of thy party, refuſe to ſtand by thy Books; and we know none of them that dare ſay, they gave thee any ſuch Authority, or choſe thee to be their Repreſentative to write in their name and behalf, as thou haſt done (againſt many faithful Friends, whom the Lord is with and will ſtand by, againſt thy crooked Spirit and Oppoſition) but rather, thoſe thy *Friends in Truth* pretended (on enquiry, if they own and will ſtand by thy Books) as it has been often asked them, particularly at *Devonſhire-houſe*, in 1681. have anſwered, *That* William Rogers *muſt anſwer for himſelf, if he hath done more than he can anſwer, or wronged any: They will not ſtand by him; 'Tis his own Act, he muſt look to it, &c.* Thus upon a pinch they leave him in the lurch to ſhift for himſelf; they'l not ſtand by him openly however; they own him not for their Repreſentative, though he hath repreſented them, and written as in their Name, Perſon and Vindication; as alſo repreſented them as Encouragers of the giving forth of his great Book, falſly ſtiled, *The Chriſtian-Quaker, &c.*

But to deal more cloſely and poſitively with

with thee in this matter, how cameſt thou to expoſe *Edward Burroughs* Name in Print, and to repreſent him as a Perſon of thy Principle and Judgment, by a confuſed, unſound whimſical Paper, which thou haſt printed in thy great Book, with *Edward Burrough*'s Name put to it, and repreſented it as his Teſtimony, and even in thy Title-page ſayſt, it was *given forth in the year* 1661. *by Edw. Burroughs*, and ſince the ſame is re-printed over and over by thy buſie informing Agent *Thomas Criſp*, as *E. B*'s *Viſion*; but I am perſwaded thou and he have groſly abuſed and miſ-repreſented that Servant of the Lord *E. B.* by rendring him the Author of ſuch Abſurdities as are contained in that ſame Paper about the *Shepherd* and his *Dogs*, *&c.* particularly in that paſſage of the '*Shepherd's gathering the Sheep with the many* '*Goats, that did puſh, trouble and hurt the* '*Sheep with their Horns, and putting them into* '*the Fold; and that he made faſt the door,* '*and would not ſeparate them until he had the* '*other Sheep alſo, that did not come with the* '*Flock.* See what Doctrine this is, as applyed to Chriſt, the good Shepherd, rendring him ſo ſevere to his Sheep, as to gather, ſhut up and keep ſo many Goats, ſo long among them in his Fold, to trouble, bruiſe and hurt his poor Sheep with their Horns. And alſo, that *Warning* and *Precept* given

given in the ſaid Paper *to Friends, for all 'to forbear judging any man any more, upon any 'pretence whatſoever:* Can any that knew *E.B.* and the ſoundneſs of judgment & underſtanding that he was attain'd to in the year 1661. believe that he was the Author of ſuch Doctrine to all Friends, as to *judge no man under any pretence whatſoever?* A man well known ſeverely to judge deceitful Workers and rebellious Ones, as (yea, he teſtified plainly againſt *John Perrot*'s ſpirit of Diviſion) is fully evinced in his Books and Writings. And I dare preſume *E.B.* never gave thee authority, nor choſe thee or *Tho. Criſp* to repreſent him in print (ſo many years after his deceaſe) as the Author of the ſaid Paper or *warning to all friends, To judge no man under any pretence whatſoever:* And yet thou art ſeverely judging and reproaching others that are not of thy party as *Apoſtates, Innovators, &c.* contrary to ſuch an expreſs *precept & doctrine* eſpouſed by thee, as *E.B*'s Teſtimony. Beſides the expreſs contradiction to thy ſelf in thus repreſenting *E. B.* in print, without his leave, authority or conſent, what great abuſe haſt thou done to him, his Memory, Name and Teſtimony, in expoſing him in Print, as Author of that which doth not ſo much as look like him or his Teſtimony, or any Viſion of his, but in the ſaid Doctrines both contrary to his Judgment and Practice?

Practice? I ſay, what a horrid Abuſe haſt thou done to the Name and Memory of the dead in Chriſt, and that by promoting a forged Subſcription, if thou canſt not give ſufficient demonſtration and proof, that *Edw. Burroughs* was the Author of the ſame Paper aforeſaid, which thou haſt expoſed in his name in Print? If thou ſayſt, *it was delivered to thee with* Edw. Burrough's *name to it:* I ſay, that's no proof of its being his; for both I and divers others have ſeen a Copy of the ſame only with *J. Perrots* name to it; aud this more probably true, that he was the Author, for divers reaſons, than thy rendring *E. B.* the Author.

Again, thou haſt alſo expoſed that honeſt and innocent Perſon *Iſaac Pennington* in Print, to ſerve thy own turn and thy parties, as a Confirmation of thy work, and that after his deceaſe alſo, for which I dare preſume he gave thee no authority, nor choſe thee ſo to repreſent him in Print, or to pick out of the middle, diminiſh or curtalize his Writings or Teſtimony, by leaving out the moſt material and explanatory precedent and ſubſequent Paſſages thereof, to the great injury and abuſe of his Intention; for which his Son *John Pennington* was ſtirred up to vindicate his deceaſed Father, and to detect thy abuſe and Prevarication. And am ſatisfied, that neither

neither *Edward Burroughs* nor *John Crook* gave thee Authority to quote or cite them, or either of them in oppoſition to *G. F.* as thou haſt *John Crook* eſpecially, in thy *Epiſtle*, pag. 3. nor to tell the World in Print, *That his Teſtimony is agreeable to thy ſence:* I do not believe *J. C.* will in the leaſt own thee in thy work of Oppoſition, and ſtrife againſt many faithful Servants of Chriſt.

Alſo, thou and *Francis Bugg* have repreſented *William Penn* in Print, on ſome paſſages pickt out of his *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, as in thy 66 and 73 pages, which he never gave you power to do, much leſs to repreſent him (as if he were one in Judgment with you againſt his Brethren) nor did he give thee or *F. Bugg* leave to diſcant upon and turn his words to ſerve your own turns, nor to apply them againſt ſuch his Friends in the Iſle of *Ely* or elſe-where, who are for Womens Meetings, and laying Marriages twice before the Mens and Womens Meetings; it is not to be ſuppoſed, that he intended [*Fly Rome at Home*] as proper Admonition to them, as thy Brother *F. Bugg* applies them, as in the Authority and genuine ſence of *Dear W. P.* p. 78, calling *William Penn*, *Dear Friend*, p. 65, *This Noble Man*, *&c.* p. 73. Which is to render *W. P.* exactly one of your own party;

party; and all this without his authority leave or consent.

But how comes he now to be *Dear William Penn*, *Dear Friend*, and *This Noble man?* Hast not thou numbred him among the Persecutors of *J. S.* and *J. W.* as thou esteemest *Charles Marshall* and *Sixty Five* more (as thy phrase is) who signed the Paper thou art so much offended at? p. 22, 27. Was not *William Penn* one of those sixty six Subscribers? And dost not thou on this very occasion retort his words [*Let us fly* Rome *at Home?*] What! must he therefore be a Persecutor of his Brethren, and yet a *Dear Friend*, *Dear William Penn*, *This Noble man*, *&c.* in thy Book? What Self-contradiction and manifest Flattery art thou and thy Brother *Bugg* (like Parasites) guilty of? Pray lift up your Eyes and see your selves, if not judicially given over to blindness and hardness of heart.

Take another Instance or two of thy Self-contradictory dealing; Didst not thou expose a Certificate or Testimony (as thou esteemedst it) of *Nathaniel Crips* in Print against *G. F.* without any Authority from *Nathaniel* for so doing? I am sure he confest as much to me and *John Bouldron* the 6th Moneth, 1679. against thy publishing it in Manuscript, as that thou didst it without

out his advice, knowledge or order; ſee our Book, *Accuſer, &c.* p. 172.

And likewiſe, that pretended Certificate or Teſtimony of *Edw. Perkins*, which thou printedſt againſt *G. F. Edward* confeſſed to me at ſundry times and before divers Perſons, that he did not give any advice or conſent to thy printing it; for 'twas printed without his knowledge. And ſo, we may queſtion or ſuppoſe thou haſt done the like in the reſt, or moſt of the pretended Teſtimonies againſt *G. F. &c.* from thoſe Women and others of *Briſtol, &c.*

Now may not I rationally take leave to reflect and argue, *ad hominem*, upon thee, and according to thy own Terms thus, *Oh! thou Imperious Map of Pride, towring lofty and Lordly Spirit, inſolent and conceited, proud Uſurper!* how durſt thou either write in the name or behalf of ſo many, whom thou counteſt Friends in Truth, and numerous too? or expoſe the names of ſo many deceaſed Servants of Chriſt in thy Quarrel, as if they were all on thy ſide and party, when thy gave thee no power, nor deputed thee ſo to do? And thou muſt anſwer for thy miſrepreſenting them, and abuſing their Names, Memories and Teſtimonies, when the chieftains of thy own party dare not ſtand by thy work, nor own thee for their Repreſentative,

Repreſentative, but leave thee to ſtand by it thy ſelf, as thy own. What an unjuſt and falſe Repreſentative haſt thou ſhewn thy ſelf, by thy own rule and manner of Reflection upon others? though I am apt to think that ſome few have privately encouraged thee in thy travail, who now are afraid publickly to ſtand by thy deform'd, inform unſhapely and monſtrous Birth, begotten and brought forth by the old Accuſer of the Brethren; though ſome are not aſhamed to promote and expoſe it to Sale, but it will turn to their own ſhame, and be their burden at length.

§. 5 Again, to prove thy falſe charge of *Apoſtacy* and *Innovation* againſt us (p. 26.) thou inſiſteſt on a Record in the Quarterly Meeting Book at *Hadenham* in the Iſle of *Ely* about * a Marriage, ſhewing Friends diſlike of the manner of proceeding and diſunion there-with. The Queſtion is, Whether the perſon concern'd gave thee Authority to expoſe this in Print to make him a ſubject of the Controverſie, and proof of our Apoſtacy? If not, as I preſume he did not *

*I tenderly forbear expoſing the Perſon's name at preſent, believing that 'twas not by his order or conſent that *W. R. & F. B.* have made him ſuch a ſubject of printed controverſie; as alſo hoping that he has more *charity & tenderneſs* in him than to allow of their malicious Books.

not, but rather *F. B. from whom*, thou ſayſt, *thou receivedſt it*; then haſt thou ſhewn thy ſelf no Friend to the Perſon concerned, in expoſing his name in Print, in a matter that tends to his diſrepute and diſgrace, and that in plain contradiction to thy own Principle and Judgment againſt us; and yet the ground of Friends diſſatisfaction in that caſe, thou doſt not demonſtrate, (wherein thou haſt done partially and unjuſtly, which neceſſitates this diſcovery) but ſayſt, *It is for not proceeding exactly in that outward new formed Method:* Whereas 'twas an Innovation or new Method that Friends were offended at, *viz.* propounding the Marriage but once to the Meeting, and that in the Womans abſence (with whom he intended Marriage) which is both a new Method and Impoſition on Friends, upon his bear word and credit, without the Woman's Teſtimony from her own Mouth, which ſhould have been allowed Friends, and that at two ſundry Meetings, from both the Perſons concerned; which is no new formed Method, but that which has been many years among us, and is a neceſſary and commendable Method, both for enquiry into the Perſons clearneſs from other Engagements, and tending to a general ſatisfaction of Friends in Truth. And this Method doth neither invalidate nor derogate from that

antient

antient Advice of Friends, cited in thy 4th Chapter concerning *Marriage*, pag 66. *viz.*

"Let it be made known to the Children "of Light, especially to those of the Mee- "ting, to which the parties are Members, "that all in the Light may witness it to be "of God, and that no Scandal may rest "upon the Truth, nor any thing done in "secret, but all things brought to the "Light, &c. This is general, and was wholsom advice. And there is no particular Method used among us, but it tends to the same good end, (*viz.* for the satisfaction and Testimony of all in the Light) and doth not in the least contradict or lessen it: Where's then the *Antichristian Imposition, Apostacy and Innovation*, thou chargest in the Contents of thy fourth Chapter? Is it in proposing Marriages twice (or at two sundry times) to the Meetings the parties belong to? and that by both the parties concerned, to prevent Scandal and Clandestine proceedings, and that Friends in the Light may witness it to be of God, which is our Method; and in which the Person aforesaid did not proceed, in his proposing his intention of Marriage but once, and that in the Womans absence (as Friends have given account) and for which cause Friends expressed they had *not Union with*

him in ſo doing: But it ſeems thou haſt, in being ſo officious an Advocate for him againſt Friends for their Conſcientious diſlike recorded againſt ſuch an Example or Preſident; and ſcoffing at our *Women Friends in the Iſle of* Ely, *as* (thou ſayeſt) *may be accounted of the QUORUM*, p. 24. Is this thy proof of *Antichriſtian Impoſition*, *Apoſtacy* and *Innovation* againſt us? Where's thy *Chriſtianity*, *Conſcience*, *Religion* and *Order* pretended? Oh! be aſhamed of thy Scornful, Unchriſtian and Infamous Attempts. And alſo it was no Friendly part in thee, to endeavour to expoſe the Quarterly Meeting of the Iſle of *Ely* in Print to publick cenſure, on the bare Information of *Francis Bugg*, thy Informer, (who has ſhewn himſelf, a Party and open Adverſary againſt that Meeting) rendring it no better than *an Impoſing Church, a Falſe Church*, p. 74. againſt whom thou haſt joyned in Judgment with him, without hearing that Meeting's own defence and anſwer to *Francis Bugg* in the caſe: Is this thy judicial and equal proceedings? Oh for ſhame, give over thy partial and impertinent Scribling! And what if the ſaid Quarterly Meeting, would not once hear *F. Bugg*'s Letter, nor ſuffer it to be read? It appears he has not behaved himſelf ſo well and obligingly to that Meeting, as to engage Friends there to

lay

lay by their *other* concerns, to hear his Letter againſt their proceeding: They were not ignorant of *F. B*'s turbulent Spirit; witneſs his troubleſom work, his ignoble, baſe and crafty dealing againſt *Samuel Cater* about the Fine, &c. a particular account whereof is expected from *G. Smith* and Friends of the Iſle of *Ely*, who know the tranſaction in the Circumſtances of the ſubtil Intreague, which poſſibly may be a Rebuke to *Francis Bugg* his Immorality in the caſe, & corrupt Conſcience, as well as to his Pride and Inſolence, as an Enſample to Poſterity, which I really think he deſerves, if he'l not ſtudy to be quiet towards Friends his peaceable Neighbours.

In his ſaid Letter to the Quarterly Meeting at *Hadenham* in the Iſle of *Ely* (and which is printed in thy Book, part 7. p. 72.) though he flatteringly begins with *Dear Friends*, he accuſeth them about the Record againſt *J. A.* as *excluding him out of the Unity of Friends, and with Excommunication, &c.* Wherein he has dealt prevaricatingly and falſly, as appears by his and thy own account of the Meeting's Record, which is, That *they have no Union with him in THIS HIS SO DOING:* Which relates to that particular *Act*, and not wholly to exclude the Perſon *out of the Unity* in all other things as one *Excommunicate*, &c. Yet he proceeds Reflectingly, telling them of *Stigmatizing*,

laying ſtreſs where God hath laid none——Excommunicating about ſuch things which are at beſt but mens Traditions, and Impoſitions——Impoſing falſe Church. Applying *William Penn*'s words, *This noble Man's words* (as he flatteringly ſtiles him) [*Fly Rome at Home*] to the ſaid Quarterly-Meeting, which were never ſo intended by *W. P.* Thus thou and *F. B.* have abuſed *W. P.* in Print, ſhamefully perverting his words and intention, who never could intend to bid a Quarterly-Meeting *Fly Rome at Home*, either for teſtifying againſt ſuch Irregularity as propoſing a Marriage but once to a Meeting, and that in the abſence of the Woman concerned; nor yet for juſtifying upon the Method of propoſing the Marriage twice before conſumated. Is this that *Rome at home* which *Thou* and *F. B.* would have Friends to *Fly?* (for I take thee and *F. B.* to be in great Union now in your work, ſeeing you appear ſo joyntly together in Print, and to charge Friends with *Impoſition, Immorality, &c.* as thou haſt done.) But he deals partially, as thou haſt done, in not manifeſting the occaſion of Friends diſſatisfaction, he charging them with *Excluding the aforeſaid Perſon, what in them lies, out of the Unity, Excommunicating, &c.* In which he placeth the Controverſie *but about manifeſting his intention to Marry*; and

Pag. 27.

P. 72.

and then crys, *Behold the Crime!* But ſhews not what it is in the manner of circumſtances of it. Thus partial and covered you are in ſtating matters.

But *the ſaid Meeting would not hear his Letter:* What great Crime was that? To this thou ſayſt, viz. *Should the Supream Power in this Nation have treated our Friends ſo as not to hear our Addreſſes, many Goals might at this day have remained full of honeſt Friends, who have been diſcharged from their ſore Impriſonments.* P. 26. There's no parallel in the caſe between Friends tender Addreſſes to Authority for Relief of Friends in Diſtreſſes, Goals, *&c.* and *F. Bugg*'s reflecting abuſive Letter to Friends, in vindication of an Irregular Practice, unwarrantable, and tending to a corrupt fleſhly Liberty, as that of *Propoſing the Marriage but once to the Meeting*, &c. Howbeit, 'tis a marvel thou wilt grant us ſo much Truth, as that our Addreſſes have at any time had ſo good effect with Authority, as to obtain the enlargement of ſo many honeſt Friends out of their ſore Impriſonments. This is more than ſome of thy Party have owned. However, conſidering thy Conceſſion herein, 'tis the worſe requital in thee to villifie and abuſe ſuch in Print as have been moſt induſtrious with the ſupream Power in the Sufferers behalf, as to my knowledge thou haſt very evilly

evilly requited and treated ſome ſuch, rather like a revengeful Perſecutor, than a Helper of the oppreſſed.

So thy Charge of *Immorality* on the Quarterly Meeting in the Iſle of *Ely*, for not hearing *F. B*'s Letter, and inſtancing the *Parliaments admitting us to repreſent our Agrievance, &c.* are ſtill both unjuſt and no ways parallel. For if we had given the like occaſion againſt the Parliament, that thou and *F. B.* have againſt us, they might very well have rejected our Applications, as Perſons inſolent to, and contemning of Government; ſhould we have rendred them no more rightly in Government than you have our Meetings for a Church of Chriſt, how ſhould they have accepted our Addreſſes? As if we ſhould have told them, they were a falſe, uſurping, impoſing, apoſtate Parliament, they might juſtly have rejected our Addreſſes.

P. 27.

§. 6. Moreover, 'tis a ſhameful Lye and Abuſe for thee again to recite the Paper from *Barbadoes*, *As one part of the fruits of the pretended eſtabliſht Government*, p. 27. ſince that Paper was ſo far from being own'd as any part of the fruits of that Government eſtabliſht (which was by Chriſt, we affirm) among us, that we have both plainly manifeſted our diſlike thereof; and

the

the Perſons concern'd in it in *Barbadoes* have themſelves retracted it, as is ſince publickly evinced in Print; yet thou art ſo unconſcionable as to render both *G. Fox*, my ſelf, &c. *as ſhewing no diſlike to the ſaid Paper*, p. 28. Oh ſhameleſs Prevaricater and Abuſer! Thou canſt not but otherwiſe underſtand divers Paſſages in our Letter about it to *Barbadoes*, which clearly beſpeaks our real diſlike of it, as thou confeſſeſt *G. F.* &c. *would ſeem to diſcourſe a little of ſomething amiſs*, &c. *'Tis evident* G. F. &c. *diſlike ſome part of the ſaid Paper*, &c. p. 29. *Seem to diſlike the latter part thereof*, p. 4. But little indeed thou makeſt of that part of our diſcourſe, but art rather willing to expoſe us unjuſtly to publick Cenſure, on thoſe words of ours which appear moſt friendly, tender and obliging, and falſly to repreſent us, *as ſhewing no diſlike to the ſaid Paper.* Adding alſo another groſs Untruth and ſelf-contradiction in the caſe, viz. *That the Penman is eſpouſing a cauſe contrary to antient Teſtimonies*, &c. p. 30. And further ſayſt, G. W. *ſmoothed up the* Barbadoes *Meeters with this Expreſſion, We know you aim at the beſt things*, p. 82. What ſmoothing was this, when we had plainly ſhewed them their Miſtake? We are ſure then 'twas not to ſmooth them up therein: And may not ſome aim at good (yea, the beſt) things, and

and yet be miſtaken in ſome caſes? What Abſurdity then have I committed, in telling them (whom I believed had a good meaning, though otherwiſe miſtaken) they aim'd at the beſt things. Thou haſt put my Name with *G. F*'s at length, with an *&c.* inſtead of *A. Parker*'s, to two or three Lines thou haſt cited in the concluſion of our Letter to *Barbadoes*, as an inſtance wherein we ſhew no diſlike to their Paper, becauſe we call our ſelves *Their dear Friends*, &c. Is this thy [*More anon*] to ſhew that *I would now be as a Lord over my Brethrens Conſciences and Eſtates?* p. 25. For I preſume 'tis me thou intendeſt; and if ſo, 'tis falſe and abuſive. [O righteous Judge of all, and Heart-ſearcher! plead thou my Innocency, and rebuke this Spirit of Envy, Falſhood and Slanders that's riſen upon againſt thy faithful Servants.]

Whereas our charitable, tender and friendly Treatment of them in *Barbadoes* rather ſhews, that we were not willing to reject, exclude or unfriend Perſons for one or two Miſtakes, than to ſeek Lordſhip over them or theirs, who otherwiſe were ſo well meaning, as that we had cauſe to believe, that God would rectifie their Judgments, and ſet them to rights in all their Undertakings. So that 'twas enough for us to ſhew our diſlike or diſunion with them

in

in that particular thing wherein they were miſtaken or erred.

CHAP. IV.

§. 1. *The great ends of Chriſtian Religion and Society being eyed, a more eaſie condeſcention and concurrence follow in leſſer matters. Things neceſſary for good order, not doubtfully recommended. Our conſiſtency in the condeſcention propoſed, and how; explain'd and clear'd from* W.R's *miſtaken Objections.* §. 2. W. R's *judging and cenſuring a Perſon (and that falſly) whilſt unheard in defence of himſelf, condemned by himſelf as a grand Mark of Apoſtacy, and he proved guilty thereof in fact.* §. 3. W. R's *Charge of* falſe Suggeſtion, Prevarication and Forgery *(reflecting on himſelf) proved notoriouſly falſe by divers Inſtances recited out of his own Book, ſhewing his general Oppoſition to outward* orders, form *and* diſcipline, *&c. relating to Church-Government: And then unſaying that oppoſition again by his finally granting both outward Order, Methods, Forms and Diſcipline under Chriſt's Government: How far binding on the Conſcience of others, enquired into. And he muſt grant Liberty of Conſcience in preaching*

ing and exhorting to things juſt, honeſt and needful, or elſe he interfers with himſelf in his plea for liberty of Conſcience. §. 4. W. R's *Confutation to himſelf apparent, in confeſſing,* That God hath afforded thoſe helps & governments in the Church, *which are not to be deſpiſed, in a Paper ſigned by him among Friends at* London, 1673. *His inſtance of W. P. againſt the* Penman *groundleſs. We clear'd from impoſing a blind Obedience, and* W. Penn's *own words farther cited to clear his intention for* liberty of Conſcience, *and from what.* §. 5. W. R's *unfair dealing and miſtaken oppoſition againſt* R. Barclay's *propoſitions concerning the Power, poſitive Sentence and Judgment of the Church of Chriſt, as being binding in* SOME CASES *of conſequence upon Believers, the Spirit of Chriſt being the only proper Judge, &c. The point at length granted by* William Rogers *himſelf.* §. 6. *Wherein* W. Rogers's *diſcourſe tends to* Libertiſm, blind Oppoſition, Confuſion *and* Ranteriſm. A blind Refuſal *of Submiſſion to what the Lord in his Servants requires, condemned, as well as blind obedience. A* Medium *between both propoſed, to prevent a* blind Refuſal *and* blind Obedience. *Of* W. R's *wrong Meaſures, falſe Judgment and Suppoſitions, Envy and Scorn, Laughter, hypocritical Lamentation, Praying,*

Cain's

Cain's *Sacrifice*, *his lofty conceited and contemning way of writing.*

§. 1. IT is true, and I am ſtill of the ſame mind, that having the great ends of true Religion and Chriſtian Society in our Eye, viz. *An unſpotted Life, Love and good Works, &c.* as the very intent of our care and proceedings in the Church of Chriſt, we can the more eaſily concur and accord as to Circumſtances and outward Methods, and in the Wiſdom of God ſo condeſcend one to another, and accomodate matters as not to divide about them, &c. And I do not find that our Oppoſer produceth any *ſeeming Contradiction* to this Citation out of our Book, as he endeavours upon our following words, *viz.* "We would "be underſtood that thoſe things com- "mended among us as neceſſary for *good* "*Order and Holineſs of Converſation* are not "recommended doubtfully, or upon meer "Suppoſition, nor as matters of indifferency "to be practiſed or rejected, but in faith & "full aſſurance, as anſwering Gods Witneſs "and Truth in the Conſciences; and that "ſuch will meet with a tender Reception, "and not Oppoſition in all tender and up- "right hearts. Where's now the ſeeming Contradiction in this to the precedent Paſſage? See what obſervation our Oppo-

ſer

ſer makes upon them. He obſerves, *That the Penman ſeems thereby to look three ways at once*, p. 36. [though his ſight and obſervation has greatly fail'd him herein] as firſt, In commending things neceſſary for good Order and Holineſs of Converſation, *NOT* as matters of Indifferency. To this *W. R.* thus ſaith, viz. *Wherein I take the trueſt ſenſe of his mind to be (and that the firſt citation importing his readineſs to condeſcend) was to cover himſelf and others from the guilt of Apoſtacy and Innovation.*

He is miſtaken in his obſervation here; there was no ſuch intent nor neceſſity for the *Pen-man* to cover himſelf or others from that guilt, for to commend things neceſſary for good Order and Holineſs of Converſation, *not as Indifferent*, but *Eſſential* to ſuch Order, *&c.* and a Condeſcention in circumſtances, and accomodating matters, ſo as not to divide, *&c.* may very well ſtand together, eſpecially where there's unity of ſpirit and affection; for if there be true love and unity in the greater matters, eſſential to good Order, *&c.* 'tis more eaſie for ſuch as are tender and upright-hearted to find out accomodation and concurrence in leſſer circumſtances. So that ſtill 'tis to be underſtood, they muſt ſettle in an union and concurrence at laſt; otherwiſe, how ſhould they joyntly do buſineſs or ſervice for the

Truth

Truth or each other? There's no concurrence nor joynt-ſervice where there's confuſion and contradiction.

But *W. R.* proceeds in his obſervation againſt the Pen-men, *viz.* 2dly, *By his readineſs to condeſcend to his Brethren (which doubtleſs in that place he intends ſuch as are upright hearted, and mean well, for 'tis not fit to condeſcend to others) and therein the indifferency before excluded is implyed.*

He's miſtaken again in's obſervation; for there may be a tender and Chriſtian condeſcention of the upright hearted among themſelves, in two reſpects:

1*ſt*, In the ſtronger bearing with, and helping the weak, bearing the burden of the weak, and not laying more upon the weak than what they are able to bear.

2*dly*, In the wiſdom of God finding out ſuch accomodation, in ſome leſſer matters & circumſtances not ſo eſſential and indiſpenſible; ſo that there may be a general concurrence, eaſe and peace of ſpirit in ſuch leſſer circumſtances, implying or including that indifferency before which is excluded the greater, more weighty and neceſſary things relating to good Order, holineſs of Life, &c. For there may be ſuch an *indifferency* in ſome circumſtances, wherein we may condeſcend to weak Brethren ſo far as the ſpirit of Chriſt will admit; they being ſuch as may

not alter the property from being good and lawful, nor disturbing to our *Christian-society*. Yet there are other material things and circumstances relating our Christian society, good order and holy living, that cannot be made Indifferent. And we plead not at all for empty Ceremonies in Church order or discipline, but such as have a real service and good end in them; nor are we for a Church whose ornaments are superstitious, but for a Church which is gravely and purely adorned with Righteousness, the fruits and services of pure Religion.

I confess *W. R.* has writ one remarkable Truth, i. e. *That 'tis not fit to condescend to others*, viz. *That are not upright hearted, that do not mean well:* Very true. And we have cause to keep to that Doctrine, in reference to such as are turbulent and contentious Troublers of and scandalous to our society and profession.

See his third Observation on the same subject before, as shallow as the rest, *viz.*

3dly, *By the Pen-man's last cited Lines, 'tis plain, that in his sence things recommended for good Order will have a reception with all upright Hearts: Which compared with his readiness to condescend,* &c. (*as before*) *shews, as if his condescention was intended to Brethren that were not upright hearted.*

Here his sight fails him, and he's greatly mistaken

miſtaken again, *perverting* the *Pen-mans* ſenſe; for though I affirm, that thoſe things recommended among us by *Divine* * *Authority and Evidence* (either as duty to God or Man, or as neceſſary for good Order and Holineſs of Converſation) will have reception with all upright Hearts. Yet it follows not, that the condeſcention was intended to Brethren that were *Not* upright hearted, or falſe. For *firſt*, Here's not a limitation of time when all things neceſſary (as before) will have reception with all upright hearts: So that there is a time and cauſe for condeſcention to them of low degree, in regard of their weakneſs (not inſincerity.) *Secondly*, Many upright ones do not preſently or immediatly ſee every thing that is recommended in the wiſdom of God to be practiſed, but muſt have time to weigh and conſider matters before the Lord firſt, in order to receive a clear underſtanding and judgment from him, before they act therein. So that in the mean time there muſt be a tender condeſcention, patience and forbearance on all hands towards ſuch, not to look upon or judge their want of preſent clearneſs (and their preſent fear to act becauſe thereof) an act of Refuſal or Rebellion on their parts: No, no, far be it from us; know-

* As our words are, *Accuſer*, p. 136.

ng that ſuch upright hearted ones, even when but in a poor low and weak ſtate, will not oppoſe, refuſe or gain-ſay any thing they at preſent ſee not that's either in it ſelf good and honeſt, or neceſſary for good order and ſociety, their uprightneſs, tenderneſs, honeſty and fear towards God, preſerves them from contention and blind oppoſition in ſuch caſes, whilſt given up tenderly to wait till God reveal that unto them (whether immediately or inſtrumentally) which for a time they have not clearneſs in: And be ſure, he will not be awanting in his divine counſel and openings to ſuch.

§. 2. To his charging the Pen-man with *a groundneſs Complaint of Printing againſt* G. F. *without firſt proceeding judicially, or hearing of matters face to face*, p. 39.

[*Groundleſs Complaint*] is an untruth; there was manifeſt ground for that complaint on *W. R*'s own confeſſion and principle, *viz.* his enveighing *againſt judging any man without hearing him: Judging the merit of the cauſe without hearing the ſame: Judging and Cenſuring a Perſon unheard in the defence of himſelf, as being a grand Mark of Apoſtacy*, as in his Preface to his *Chriſtian-Quaker*. That *W. R.* has ſo (*ipſo facto*) judged and condemned G. F. and others in divers

divers things unheard in their own defence, we have produced divers ſufficient and unanſwered Inſtances in our Treatiſe entituled, *The Accuſer of our Brethren caſt down*; and particularly his falſe conſtruction on *G. F*'s words, *viz.* [*Do not make Bargains with that which is out of the Truth*] On which *W. R.* concludes a *deſign of Impoſition, and ſo far as in* G. F. *lies to obſtruct Friends from bargaining with ſuch whom he condemns, as having no right to bargain, buy or ſell, until they anſwer by Condemnation; or elſe, that his meaning was, that* G. F. *would not have Friends diſcourſe with ſuch, nor yet to agree about any orderly Conference, in order to a Reconciliation or Hearing of Differences,* &c. *concluding it muſt be one of theſe two meanings, becauſe a third he could not think of,* as the matter is fully treated on in our ſaid Treatiſe, *Accuſer*, p. 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, &c. in which *W. R*'s judgment, and both his ſuppoſed Meanings are proved untrue. But ſtill, to aggravate the matter againſt *G. F.* he ſaith, *He has uſed the utmoſt of his endeavours to obtain a Meeting with him for ſuch an end* (that is, for a hearing of matters face to face) *at ſeveral times ſince his laſt being in* Briſtol *in the year* 1677. *and it will not be condeſcended to,* (ſaith he) p. 39, 40. This ſtill the more confirms the Complaint againſt him, *viz.* his Printing againſt

G. F. (yea, judging and condemning him without hearing the matters face to face, for which he is condemned; which is an extradicial and injurious proceedure, and *grand Mark of Apoſtacy* ſo to do, according to *W. R*'s own judgment. And his pretence, *That ſuch a Meeting will not be condeſcended to*, will not excuſe the fact, that is, his judging and cenſuring a Perſon unheard in his own defence, &c. as a *grand Mark of Apoſtacy*. He might have had patience, and rather waited an opportunity for meeting with *G. F.* than have condemned him in Print in divers things, unheard in his own defence, and that on his own falſe Suggeſtions, Meanings and Conſtructions) contrary to his own Doctrine, which is become his own Self-condemnation.

§. 3. Now wherein doth the Pen-man's *falſe Suggeſtion and Unchriſtian-like Treatment* conſiſt, to prove him *an Impious Prevaricator, or down-right Forger*, as *W. R.* terms him? p. 41. See how he attempts proof, in theſe words, *viz.*

I ſhall at preſent cite only a few Inſtances thereof in his own words, (quoth he) *viz.* 'p. 73. His main work is ſtill to invalidate 'the Authority and Sentence of the true 'Church. *Pag.* 87. Which anſwers and 'confutes *W. R.* in oppoſing outward Di-

'rections,

'rections, Methods and Forms relating to 'Church Government. *Pag.* 88. His prin-'cipal Objection againſt outward Orders, 'Preſcriptions, Sentences, Decrees, Form 'of Church Government, Diſcipline, *&c.* '*P.* 91. His gain-ſaying and general Obje-'ctions againſt us in relation to Church Go-'vernment and Order amongſt us the People 'called *Quakers*. *P.* 261. Which anſwers 'his general oppoſition to outward Order, 'Form and Diſcipline. [Thus hath *W. R.* cited our words by pieces.]

Now if it be made appear, that theſe things are juſtly laid to *W. R*'s charge from his own words and ſence thereof, I hope he'l ſee cauſe to be aſhamed of his clamour of *falſe Suggeſtion*, *impious Prevaricator*, &c. In order to which I thus directly proceed:

Firſt, That his work has been to invalidate the authority and ſentence of the true Church: On *Mat.* 5. and *chap.* 6. he ſaith, *Wherein there's not the leaſt tittle to countenance this ſentence, That the poſitive Sentence or Deciſion of the Church in matters of Conſcience, may be obligatory on Believers*, as in the third part of his *Chriſtian-Quaker*, p. 64. And his conteſt againſt thoſe, *who* (he ſaith) *have approved a Plea for ſuch a Church Government as claims a power of deciding matters relating to Conſcience and outward things, on occaſion of Differences about worldly Eſtate*;

and that others ought to obey ſuch Deciſions, which ſays he) *in its natural conſequence hath* (*as we take it*) *no leſs tendency than to claim Power over our Properties as well as Conſciences*, as in the firſt part of his *Chriſtian-Quaker*.

[*Note*; A ſad, but fallacious conſequence, detected in our Treatiſe, *Accuſer*, from pag. 53, to p. 76.]

Is it not plain, that *W. R.* has here endeavoured to invalidate the authority and ſentence of the true Church (by us pleaded) if neither obligatory on Believers in matters of Conſcience, nor in outward things? Or if the Church may not be allowed a Power of making deciſions in matters of difference, either relating to Conſcience or outward Eſtate, according to *Mat.* 18. 17. and 1 *Cor.* 6. of what validity is the authority, ſentence or power of the Church with *W. R*? What's more plain againſt him than his own words before recited?

Secondly, That he has oppoſed and objected againſt outward *Orders*, *Forms*, *Diſcipline*, *Preſcriptions*, *Sentences*, *Decrees*, his *Gain-ſaying* and *general Objections* and *Oppoſition* to outward Order, Form and Diſcipline relating to Church Government, &c. ſee how he argues the caſe againſt *outward Orders*, *Preſcriptions*, *Sentences*, *Decrees*, *&c.* under the new Covenant, *viz.* becauſe the Apoſtle's labour was to draw the outward

Jew

Jew off from the obſervation of their outward Ordinances, to the Word and Law in the heart; and becauſe the new Covenant was not to be like unto the old; he therefore appeals *To every Ingenious and Impartial Reader, whether it can conſiſt with the tenor of the new Covenant for* ANY *to attempt the eſtabliſhment or giving forth of outward Orders, Preſcriptions, Sentences or Decrees, to be a Bond upon the Conſciences of thoſe who have believed in the Everlaſting Light, eſpecially thoſe of the* Gentiles *ſtock*, his *Chr. Qua.* part 1. p. 73. How now *William?* Is not here general Oppoſition, &c. detected and anſwered in our ſaid Treatiſe, *Accuſer, &c?* p. 88, 89.

Another Inſtance is where *W. R.* ſaith, viz. *We have no ground either from the Word of the Lord, the appearance of Chriſt, or from the Scriptures of Truth, ſince Chriſt's appearance in the fleſh, to expect that any ſhould be inveſted with Power from on high to eſtabliſh ſuch things relating to the Conſcience* (*i. e.* outward Orders, Preſcriptions, Sentences, Decrees, as before) *much leſs that the Children of Light under the new Covenant ſhould be led by the eternal Spirit and Word in the heart unto ſuch Conformity*; his *Chr. Quaker*, part 1. pag. 75.

What ſayſt thou yet *William* to theſe plain Inſtances out of thy own great Book? Surely

Surely hadſt thou but taken a more ſtrict and ſerious notice of them, as plainly cited in our Treatiſe, thou wouldſt not have charged any of us with *falſe Suggeſtion or Forgery, in repreſenting as if thou hadſt wrote againſt outward Orders, Forms, Diſcipline.* This is no Forgery nor Prevarication (*William*). Peruſe thy great Book a little better, with our Obſervations upon it in our ſaid Treatiſe: Conſider in calmneſs, if thou mayſt not be aſhamed thus to evade and deny thy own words? and of thy clamour, and ſaying, *That not a word is cited, nor yet can be, out of any thing thou haſt written, that may carry ſuch an import,* viz. *as if thou hadſt wrote againſt outward Orders, Forms, Diſcipline,* &c. *in a general way,* p. 41. Thou writeſt *That* in one Book which thou denyeſt the plain import of (as well as the matter) in another, ſaying and unſaying. Be aſhamed therefore, and alſo of thy roaring and belching out ſuch Slanders and Falſhood alſo, as *The impious prevaricating Pen-man——doth not quote any ſentence of mine confuted, &c.* p. 42. What haſt thou done leſs than wrote againſt *outward Orders, Forms, Diſcipline,* &c? What means thy ſaying before, That *we have* NO GROUND *either from the Word of God, Chriſt or Scriptures, to expect that* ANY *ſhould be inveſted with Power from on high to eſtabliſh ſuch things* (as

(as before?) Is not here general Oppoſition, both to ſuch things and to ſuch a Conformity?

Pleaſe to review another inſtance or two of thy Oppoſition, as before, *viz.*

1*ſt*, Where in the Title-page of the 3d part of thy *Chriſtian-Quaker*, where to *the inward Government of Chriſt* thou oppoſeſt *viſible perſons being inveſted with power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, Preſcriptions, Orders, Edicts or Decrees in an outward Form of Government viſible, &c.* See now how general thy oppoſition is, and detected in our Treatiſe, *Accuſer*, p. 117, 118, 119, to p. 137.

2*dly*, The compariſon before-cited between the *Pope, who is a viſible man, in accounting himſelf inveſted with Power to execute outward Laws, Edicts and Decrees*, on the one part, *and the Pen-man and ſome of his Brethren on the other part; herein*, thou ſayſt, *thou placeſt not much difference between them, &c.* p. 18. of thy 7th part. Who can here reaſonably underſtand thee otherwiſe, than that thou oppoſeſt the Doctrine or Principle it ſelf, as well as the Pope, *viz. That any viſible man is inveſted with Power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, Edicts and Decrees under Chriſt's Government*, leſt thou ſhouldſt reſemble the Pope. For we may rationally take it for granted in thoſe things,

things, doctrines or principles wherein thou compareſt the Pope & any of us, thou wouldſt be lookt upon as of a contrary mind and judgment, that thou mightſt not be thought like the Pope in any thing whereof thou condemneſt others, as either like him, or as not much differing from him, otherwiſe thy compariſons or ſimilitudes do condemn thy ſelf as well as others, whom thou ſmiteſt at. And ſo, if thou counteſt it Popery or reſembling the Pope, to ſay, That *a viſible man or men are inveſted with power from Chriſt to execute* (or put in practice) *any outward Laws, Edicts or Decrees under Chriſt's Government*, then we muſt take thee as ſaying (and as we have underſtood thee) *That no viſible man or men are ſo inveſted with Power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, &c.* Which ſtill ſhews thy oppoſitions and objections before rehearſed, and clears thy opponent from the foul Imputations of *Impious Prevaricator, down right Forger, Impious Prevaricating Pen-man, &c.* and thy ſelf a notorious Slanderer therein, as well as ſhews thy inadvertency and overly ſhuffling, and foully ſlubbering over matters under debate and controverſie, and with what blunt and dull tools and weapons thou art toiling and fighting.

Howbeit, we may hear *W. R.* a little further, in his attempts to clear himſelf, and prove

prove his charge of *falſe Suggeſtion, Impious Prevaricator, &c.* he alledges chiefly two things, *viz.*

1ſt, *That he owns the Government of Chriſt in his Church, knowing that 'tis his right to govern his Church*; which *W. R.* alſo confeſſeth, *The Pen-man ſignifies he underſtands by* **Church-Government.**

Obſerve by the way; this is general, and not an Anſwer ſufficient to clear him; 'twill not do his buſineſs. Againſt whom did he alledge this, when we never queſtioned Chriſt's Government in his Church? But the Pen-man and his Friends (*viz.* the peaceable People call'd *Quakers*) own Chriſts Government, both in the inward and in the outward parts of it, both as he governs and rules immediately by his Spirit, and inſtrumentally by his faithful Servants inveſted with power and wiſdom from him, as before explained; which I find not that *W. R.* hath owned with any conſiſtency or clearneſs, but has appeared very inconſiſtent, oppoſit and frequently contradictory both to us and to himſelf in the matter, ſaying and unſaying (firſt in one Book, then in another) as is fully evinced in our Treatiſe, entituled, *The Accuſer, &c.* (as from p. 83, to p. 91. and from p. 204, to p. 227.) and alſo in this.

2*dly*, He alledges, that he has teſtified, *That the Apoſtles labours were to eſtabliſh the Churches*

Churches in the Faith and in the Power, leaving them ſo eſtabliſhed, to be in the practice of THAT FORM *which the Power either had or ſhould lead them into. Moreover,* (ſaith W. R.) *My proceedings in the Marriage of two Daughters within three years laſt paſt, and frequent concern amongſt Friends in taking care that no proceedings in Marriages may be permitted in any ſuch private Methods as may be ſcandalous to Truth, ſhews my practice and principle to be otherwiſe——And indeed I can in Truth ſay, That I never had a thought entred in my Breaſt, that* OUTWARD ORDER, *Methods, Forms and Diſcipline were not to be exerciſed, and proceeded in* * *under the Government of Chriſt, according as the Spirit of the Lord ſhould direct and guide,* p. 42. [Thus far *W. R.*]

* Who muſt ſo exerciſe and proceed in them if no viſible man or men be inveſted with Power from Chriſt to execute them, or put them in practice?

Obſerve; He has here given a very fair and ample conceſſion to Truth in words, *viz.*

1ſt, *To the Apoſtles labours for the Churches eſtabliſhment in the Faith and in the Power.*

2dly, *To the practice of that Form which the Power ſhould lead them into.*

3dly, *To his care in the Marriage of his two Daughters, and others, that* NO *Proceedings in Marriages may be permitted in any ſuch*

ſuch private Methods as may be ſcandalous to Truth.

4thly, *To outward Order, Methods, Forms and Diſcipline, that they are to be exerciſed and proceeded in under Chriſt's Government, according as his ſpirit directs and guides.*

Are they ſo? A fair confeſſion! Had he alwayes kept to this method and language, and ſo been conſiſtent with himſelf, the Controverſie had been in a narrow compaſs. But though he ſeems ſeriouſly to ſay, *That he never had a thought entred his breaſt, that outward Order, Methods, Form and Diſcipline were not to be exerciſed and proceeded in under the Government of Chriſt,* I query, (on his contradiction) how they ſhould be exerciſed and proceeded in under Chriſts Government in his Church, if ſo be it cannot conſiſt with the tenor of the new Covenant for any to give forth outward Orders, Sentences, Decrees, &c? Or if Chriſt doth inveſt none with Power from on high to eſtabliſh ſuch things relating to Conſcience (as outward Order, Methods, Forms, Diſcipline, &c?) Or if no viſible Perſons be inveſted with power from Chriſt to execute outward Laws, Preſcriptions, Order, &c? How then are outward Order, Methods, Forms and Diſcipline to be exerciſed and proceeded in under Chriſt's Government? And who are to exerciſe and proceed in them

them, if not visible Persons? May not they declare and practise outwardly what they have received from Christ inwardly? How then shall the Law go forth of *Sion*, and the Word from *Jerusalem?* But if he grants that some persons are made instrumental under Christs Government, to give forth good outward Methods, Forms, Order, Discipline, &c. but not to be a bond on the Consciences of others who have believed in the everlasting Light: This appears contradictory again: (*William*, was thy proceedings in the Marriage of two Daughters, and thy care that Truth might not be scandalized, no bond upon thine or their Consciences?) How are outward Methods, Forms, Order and Discipline then to be practised and proceeded in under Christ's Government? Must they be so practised, exercised and proceeded in by Believers, without Conscience, or without Obligation, or being binding upon their Consciences? Strange Doctrine, loose and confused, and not consistent with any Religious tender Conscience towards God or Christ, which requires all to be done in his name, and to his glory.

But after all our Oppofers variations, inconsistencies and whirlings, he is fled to this Refuge, or rather Subterfuge, *viz.* That *his writing shews dislike to Man's Pretence to*

establish

eſtabliſh outward Orders, relating to matters of Conſcience, as the Order of the Goſpel, or to take upon him the giving forth of any outward Rules, &c. *relating to* Faith *and* Diſcipline *in the Church, with intent that they ſhould become a Bond upon others to ſubmit thereto, further than from a Recommendation unto the Conſcience, a ſervice may be ſeen therein, according to the meaſure of Light given,* &c. pag. 41. Pag. 41.

Obſerve, 1*ſt*, This cenſures only MAN's PRETENCE to eſtabliſh outward Orders relating to Conſcience, &c.

2dly, *Man's taking upon him to give forth any outward Rules in Faith or Diſcipline in the Church, with intent they ſhould become a Bond upon others*, to ſubmit further than (from a Recommendation to the Conſcience) a *ſervice MAY* be ſeen therein, according to the meaſure of Light given, &c.

Whereupon 'tis to be noted, *firſt*, That this does not oppoſe the Spirit of Chriſt, making uſe of man or men, as inſtrumental to eſtabliſh or give forth outward Orders, Rules, &c. relating to Conſcience, Faith or Diſcipline in the Church, to be ſubmitted unto.

2*dly*, Nor ſuch outward Orders, Rules, &c. as a ſervice may be ſeen in, according to the meaſure of the true Light given. But only a diſlike to *MAN's PRETENCE* & *TAKING*

UPON HIM therein. Which I understand is intended, as *without the true Spirits Guidance*. Which appears still to be an Abatement and Extinuation of his more general reiterated Opposition and Noise against *ANY* giving forth outward Orders, Prescriptions, &c. or being invested with Power from Christ to execute outward Laws, Orders, *&c.* under Christs inward Government, because the new Covenant and its Law is inward. For now he only opposeth *Man's Pretence and Taking upon him* in these cases; and who must be Judge that he is but a Pretendor, and an Actor in his own will, if the Rules, Directions or Laws he declares or gives out be in themselves Honest, Lawful and Just, yea Convenient and Needful, not of Man, nor by the Will of Man? Were not this to judge of Spirits without outward evidence or proof against them? But if our Opposer would place the Controversie against some Rules, Orders, &c. among us, as being in themselves either unjust, unlawful or dishonest, and could make sufficient proof thereof, that would both greatly narrow and soon determine the Controversie: For that can be no good nor true Spirit that gives forth bad or unjust Laws, otherwise we have no reason to give credit to him in his bitterly smiting with words of hatred against any

Men

Men or Perſons among us, whilſt ſpeaking, miniſtring or acting things juſt, lawful or honeſt, and needful, as bound in Conſcience to declare and adviſe others to practiſe, (and which he muſt grant them Liberty both to ſpeak and act, or elſe hee'l miſerably interfer with his pretended Liberty of Conſcience) Seeing whatſoever things are honeſt, juſt and of good report, are to be thought on and practiſed.

That *W. R*'s great Book aforeſaid (as it is againſt *R. B*'s Book for Church-Government) is againſt Church-Government, ſo far as it relates to an outward Form of Church-Government, outward Order, Rules, Methods, &c. And this is no *Prevarication*, as now he renders it, as is evident from divers paſſages before recited, and by himſelf frequently contradicted. *pag.* 42.

§. 4. Alſo, 'tis a manifeſt falſhood, where *W. R.* ſaith, *That the Prevaricating Pen-man doth not quote any Sentence of his, confuted by his aſſerting,* (in a Paper dated *London*, 26th of the 3d Moneth, 1673.) *That God hath in his Wiſdom afforded thoſe Helps and Governments in the Churches, which are not to be deſpiſed, being in ſubjection to Chriſt the one Head and Law-giver*, &c. [This was ſigned by *W. R.* among other Friends] *pag.* 42.

If no visible Persons be invested with Power from Christ to execute outward Laws, Orders, &c. in an outward Form of Church-Government; Or if it be *Popery*, or like the Pope, or inconsistent with the New Covenant so to do, (as he has insinuated) what and where are those *Helps* and *Governments*, which God in his Wisdom hath afforded in his Churches, in subjection to Christ? Are no visible Persons instrumental therein by the Power of Christ? Or are they Helps and Governments, or helpers in Government without visible Persons? Were Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, Elders, Overseers, &c. in the *Christian* Churches no visible Persons, or not so indued with Power from Christ to be helpers in the Government? See 1 *Cor.* 12. 28.

I confess I know not how to reconcile our Opposer to himself in these matters, no more than I can find Reason or Proof for his black Charges of *Impious Prevaricating Pen-man*; *Oh Impious Prevaricator! perverse and hard Heart*; *qualified like a proud Prelate*; *The Pen-man's Iniquity*; *angry Waspish Pen*, &c. [Thus he.] I must needs say, he's far more loud in his Censures than in's Proofs.

If our Opposer did impartially consider and compare *William Penn's Address to Protestants*,

teſtants, quoted by him, he would ſee there's no *Laſh to the Pen-man* (as he falſly affirms) ſeeing *W. P.* grants, *that the one Shepherd may have many Servants*, p. 44. And on 2 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. He further ſaith, *Here is the utmoſt Impoſition the Apoſtle makes uſe of; He requires not men to receive him without Evidence*, &c. p. 44. No more do we, whom Chriſt hath called forth in his Service and Miniſtry, in this his day, who by the manifeſtation of Truth, commend our ſelves to every mans Conſcience in the ſight of God, having renounced the hidden things of Diſhoneſty, &c. Here's no cauſe to complain for want of Evidence, or of Impoſition without Evidence, in plainly diſcovering or ſhewing the hidden things of diſhoneſty. Truth in its manifeſtation, both in the Miniſtry and in the Hearers Conſcience, is Evidence, both againſt what's Diſhoneſt, and for what's Honeſt: God would not have Men blind in their Duty, their own Negligence and Prejudice is cauſe of blindneſs. Nor hath this Perſon convicted us of pleading for or ſetting up *Impoſition without Evidence in the Conſcience*, or of *Impoſing a blind Obedience*, or putting any Perſons thereupon; No, my very Soul is againſt that. And though *W. P.* alſo has writ againſt Impoſition without Conviction; the Pen-man ſeems to have no

other ſence, nor doth it follow that he is either againſt Church Diſcipline, outward Order or Form of Church-Government (but for theſe) in the Church of Chriſt and *Chriſtian* Societies; he being Principl'd for the true Church, having Power from Chriſt to give Judgment, ſpiritual Cenſures and Sentences againſt all dark Spirits that ſow Diſcord and make Diviſion, and againſt all ungodly, looſe, diſorderly and ſcandalous walking and walkers under profeſſion of Truth. I'le adventure to quote *William Penn*'s *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, to ſhew his Principle and Sence in theſe matters: In page 214. he ſaith, "No Scripture-"Church-Diſcipline is hereby oppugned or "weakned: Let not the Sentence end in "Violence upon the Conſcience unconvinced. Let whoſo will expound or determine, ſo it be according to true "Church-Diſcipline, which can be exerciſed on them only, who have willingly "joyn'd themſelves in that Covenant of "Union, &c. P. 215. Let us obſerve what "ſort of Church-Government the Apoſtle "recommends; *Avoid fooliſh Queſtions and "Contentions*, &c. *A man that is an Here-"tick, after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, "reject*, &c. And on *Phil.* 3. 15. He did "not ſay, You ſhall be Fined, Pillaged, Ex-"communicated, and flung into Priſon, if "ye

"ye be not of our mind. P. 216. on 2 *Tim.* "2. 22, 23, 24, 25. Here is both Faith "and Government, Religion and Duty, "all that becomes us towards God, our "Brethren, our Neighbours, yea, our Op- "poſers and Enemies. And *W. P.* in his *Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spiritual*, he doth more particularly explain and clear the Point, to Friends, firſt in his Epiſtle, ſaying, *Chriſt's Liberty is obtained through his Croſs; they that would be his Free-men muſt be his Bonds-men, and wear his bleſſed Yoke: His Liberty is from Sin, not to Sin; to do his will, not our own.* And ſecondly, he ſpeaks farther to it in the ſaid *Examination.*

Obſerve; Here *W. P.* pleads not for a Liberty of Conſcience, in oppoſition *to true Church-Government, Diſcipline or Order*, but to thoſe outward Penalties, Perſecutions and Puniſhments, corporal and pecuniary, mentioned and oppoſed by him and the reſt of us, which is no Liberty to make Diviſion or Diſcord in the Church of Chriſt or Society of Believers,

§. 5. To the Queſtion, Whether the Church of Chriſt hath Power in any caſes, that are matters of Conſcience, to give a poſitive Sentence and Deciſion, which may be obligatory upon Believers? To this

R. B. anſwers affirmatively, SHE HATH, *Anarch.* p. 48. And,

Whereas *R. B.* pleaded for the Church of Chriſt having Power in SOME CASES of Conſcience to give a poſitive Sentence or Deciſion, which may be obligatory upon Believers. (To this *W. R.* ſaith) *Which clearly ſhews to us* R. B's *meaning to be, That in ſome caſes the Conſciences of Believers ought to be bound by the poſitive Sentences of others.* (To which he adds) *Without leaving any Liberty for a Believer to refuſe to ſubmit on the account of not ſeeing it his duty to ſubmit. This meaning and Government* (ſaith *W. R.*) *over Believers, we take to be contrary to the Principle of Truth and Liberty we have in Chriſt Jeſus, &c.* p. 44.

Herein he appears both unfair in his citation, and miſtaken in his conſtruction: For 1ſt, The [*ſome caſes*] intended, (wherein a poſitive Judgment or Sentence from ſome Members or Believers is binding upon others) are ſuch Caſes, "Wherein only "the *Truth*, the *Spirit of God* doth give the "Judgment through ſome or other in the "Church of Chriſt. The only proper "Judge of Controverſies in the Church, is "the Spirit of God, and the power of deci-"ding ſolely lies in it (ſaith *R. B.*) *Anarch.* pag. 66. As alſo, "That God hath ordi-"narily in communicating his Will under "his

"his Goſpel, employed ſuch whom he "made uſe of in gathering his Church, and "in feeding & watching over them, though "not excluding others. Thus *R. B*'s *Anarchy of the Ranters*, p. 67, 68. Obſerve here, that he placeth the Judgment or Sentence (as binding, and to be ſubmitted unto by others) profeſſing the ſame Faith) on the *Truth, the Spirit of God, the Will of God.*

2*dly*, And therefore the Judgment is not placed upon any Impoſition or Government over Believers, contrary to the Principle of Truth or Liberty that's in Chriſt Jeſus; for the Judgment of Truth, or of the holy Spirit, which unites in one Mind and Judgment, cannot be contrary to that Principle, nor without evidence in the *Conſcience* for conviction to oblige, and the Conſcience thus obliged is not without true ſight, ſence or knowledge of duty therein, becauſe 'tis *Conſcience obliged*, not a blind affection. So 'tis not to impoſe a *blind Submiſſion*, though ſome's want of perſwaſion may probably proceed from their being hardened (through Rebellion) as *R. B.* intimates, *Anarch.* p. 67. And their contradiction in that caſe will not excuſe them from being guilty of diſobeying God, becauſe it is from his Spirit the ſentence proceeds; and 'tis their duty both to ſee, receive & ſubmit to what's juſtly *required*. The intent of the

Spirit

Spirit of God in giving forth Judgment or Sentences through his Servants (to end Controverſie, &c.) doth not beſpeak or intend any deſign of ſuch Impoſition, as to enforce any upon *a blind Submiſſion or Obedience*, in ſuch a hardened Condition; for the Spirit of Chriſt ſtrives with them to open their Eyes, and enlighten their Underſtandings, that they may ſee and know in their own Conſciences firſt, their Duty, and then ſubmit in what is according to the will of God, being the judgment of his Spirit, which makes its way with its own evidence to the Conſciences and Hearts of Perſons, if not wholly harden'd through Rebellion againſt God's Spirit in themſelves: *For the Teſtimony of the Lord is ſure, making Wiſe the Simple. The Commandment of the Lord is pure,* ENLIGHTNING *the Eyes,* Pſal. 19.

3*dly*, Then what *power* or *freedom* can any Miniſter or Servant of Chriſt have, to leave any liberty for a *believer* to refuſe ſubmiſſion to the judgment of the Spirit of Chriſt in his *ſervants* or *believers* where *Chriſt* leaves none? or to grant that he may not ſee it his duty to ſubmit, and thereupon to refuſe when the *ſpirit* of *Chriſt* (who knows the Creatures capacity) gives the Judgment, and requires Submiſſion? There's no juſt ground nor pretence for ſuch Indulgence, which tends to Rebellion and Ranteriſm, but rather for the

the Servants of Christ to be faithful and ſtedfaſt in their Teſtimony and Judgment, which they know is both in it ſelf Juſt, and proceeding from his Spirit. Whether it be by others received or rejected: *He that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches*; which doth many times ſpeak through Inſtruments as formerly.

And further, 'tis neither a falſe ſence, nor wicked conſtruction, to ſay, That our Oppoſer *being for a Liberty for Believers to refuſe to ſubmit on account of not ſeeing it their duty: Therefore, that Believers* (who are members of Chriſt's Church) *may refuſe ſubmiſſion to their Brethren in things that are in themſelves Juſt and Reaſonable, according to the Law of Truth in the Conſcience, on pretence of not ſeeing it their duty, &c.* I do ſincerely profeſs, I do not find a more natural conſtruction that our Oppoſers own Words (being without diſtinction) will bear, all material and precedent Cauſes and Circumſtances of this very point in Controverſie conſidered.

For *firſt*; The Submiſſion pleaded for by *R. B.* among Believers, and in the Church, was to the Judgment and poſitive Sentence proceeding from the Spirit of God or Chriſt in his Church and Servants.

Secondly; Our Adverſary's oppoſing the Church

Church of Christ's *having Power in any cases of Conscience, to give positive Sentence or Decision, which may be obligatory on Believers, rendring this a Government over Believers, contrary to the Principle of Truth and Liberty in Christ Jesus*: See *Accuser*, &c. from p. 62, to 81. When no other Submission is pleaded for, nor any other intended by us, than to such Judgment or Sentence as originally proceeds from the Spirit of Truth, which is agreeable to the will and mind of God. Now, doth not our Adversary's opposition tend to divide Believers and the Church of Christ, as well as from a true sight and performance of their Duty, in cases wherein the Spirit of Christ gives the Judgment (which must needs be just and reasonable.) For to the Question, Whether the Church of Christ hath Power in ANY CASES of Conscience, to give positive sentence, which may be obligatory upon Believers? *R. B.* Answers affirmatively, *SHE HATH*, *Anarch.* p. 48. To which *W. R.* replyes, *This Government over Believers is contrary to the Principle of Truth and Liberty in Christ Jesus.* Doth not this plainly imply, that in *NO CASES* of Conscience a Believer is bound to submit to the positive sentence of the Church of Christ, or other Members thereof, but that a Believer may refuse Submission, *On the account of not seeing it his Duty to submit.* (This is *W. R's* great pre-

tence

tence and ſuppolition) and this [*in ANY CASES of Conſcience*] without diſtinction. (The terms of the Queſtion and Oppoſition before cited being general:) Which ſuppoſed Blindneſs and Diſcord in Believers I cannot grant him againſt any true or ſincere Believers, who are faithful to Chriſt in their meaſures of Grace received; ſuch will neither want a ſight of thoſe Dutyes, or things the Spirit of Chriſt teacheth and requireth of them; nor ſubmiſſion one to another therein, but in humbleneſs of mind ſubmit themſelves one to another in the fear of God, *Epheſ.* 5. 1. 21. Here the Younger ſubmits to the Elder, and all one to another, being clothed with Humility; *for God reſiſteth the Proud, but giveth Grace to the Humble*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. This Humility and Submiſſion was among the Primitive Chriſtians, and was very commendable among them; and none but the Proud oppoſe it. And farther, the Sentence, Judgment and Determination proceeding from the Spirit of Chriſt in the midſt of his Church, is *Binding* in Heaven and Earth; and he that will not hear the Church (where Chriſt is in the midſt) is to be accounted as an *Heathen* Man. Moreever, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt knows how much

Rom 2 8. 1 *Cor.* 16. 16. 1 *Theſ* 5 12, 13, 14. *Heb.* 13 17. 2 *Pet.* 3. 2.

much or how little a burthen to proportion and lay upon his ſincere and true Followers, from the greateſt to the leaſt of them, ſuitable to their Capacities: He knows our Weakneſſes, and is touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, and hath raiſed up a Spiritual fellow-feeling of one anothers ſtates and conditions, that we might bear each others Burthens, the ſtrong to bear with and help the weak, and ſo fulfill the Law of Chriſt.

But ſeeing our Oppoſer at length (to acquit himſelf) gives us this Conceſſion, pag. 45. viz. *I do ſay, a Believer in Chriſt ought to ſubmit to any reaſonable juſt Judgment (anſwering the Truth in the Conſcience) when it relates to him, let it ſpring from whom it will*, I ſhall ſay the leſs in this point. But (*William*) haſt thou been always of this mind? If thou haſt, thou art very inconſiſtent in thy writing, and greatly wrongeſt thy ſelf by Self-contradictions; and then what ſignifies all thy oppoſing *R. B.* for pleading a conſciencious Submiſſion in Believers to the poſitive judgment or ſentence, which (as he ſaith) proceeds from the Spirit of God in ſome or other of their Brethren in the Church of Chriſt? What amounts all thy work of Oppoſition and Gain-ſaying unto? Now a *Believer in Chriſt ought to ſubmit to any Reaſonable juſt judgment, let it ſpring from*

whom

whom it will. And ſure, all judgment proceeding from the Spirit of God (in any of his Servants) is juſt and reaſonable; for whatſoever is unjuſt, is not of God, but to be rejected: The Controverſie is not there.

§. 6. Again *(William)* upon our words, *viz.* [God preſerve his people from this Libertine Spirit] thou falſly noteſt, That *(by the Pen-man's diſcourſe) a Believer's refuſal to ſubmit to the Church, on account of not ſeeing it his Duty to ſubmit, is the fruit of a Libertine Spirit,* &c. p. 45.

[*A Believer's refuſal to ſubmit to the Church*] is a begging the Queſtion, and fallacy; for I do not own that any true Believer will *REFUSE* to ſubmit to the Church of Chriſt in any thing that Chriſt, commands, or is in it ſelf his juſt duty towards God or his Neighbour [*on the account of not ſeeing it his duty*] is again a begging the Queſtion. If it be his Duty and required of him by the Spirit of God in his ſervants, the ſame ſpirit (if he minds it) quickly makes an immediate diſcovery of it to (and impreſſion on) his Conſcience, it being his duty both to ſee and ſubmit to what Truth and Juſtice require of him; ſo as the ſincere and tender-hearted, though but weak in the Faith for a time, are preſerved

ſerved on the one hand from Rebellion, and from *Refuſing* that ſubmiſſion which the Lord requires, and on the other hand from running into a blind Obedience. For put caſe there be a little ſpace of time, that one weak in the faith ſees not preſently every thing that may be required by the Lord in his People, as duty, he does not therefore *REFUSE Submiſſion*, but waits patiently on the Lord, to clear up his way, and reveal his duty therein; and though whilſt thus waiting for ſatisfaction and clearneſs, he's neither *refuſing* nor *oppoſing* that which he has not a clearneſs of judgment in. Want of ſight, or clearneſs in ſuch caſes of Conſcience, is no juſt ground for *Refuſal*, *Rejection* or *Oppoſition*, no more than for any to act in a blind Obedience or ignorant Devotion, without ſatisfaction in Faith or Conſcience. Let but *blind Oppoſition* and *Refuſal* as well as *blind Obedience* be laid aſide, and we ſhall have quietneſs; for though neither be good, yet *blind Oppoſition* is the worſt of the two. For there's yet a *Medium* between *Refuſal* and *Active Submiſſion*, viz. *A WAITING paſſively and patiently until God reveal his will in this or that particular thing required by him as duty.*

Again, thou doſt both ſcornfully and fallaciouſly proceed againſt the Pen-man in theſe words, viz. *'Tis plain to me, that he (reputing*

(*reputing himself a Church-Governour*) *is thirsting after such a sort of Subjects that may be willing to follow his Track, though they know not whether it be right or wrong*, p. 45.

I presume thou meanest my self, as that Pen-man that so affects being a Governour, or so reputeth, as thou hast before twitted the Pen-man with *having forgotten his low and mean Estate* (telling him *how the very conceit of being a Governour in an outward Government, is very apt to puff up Persons of some sort of Qualifications*, pag. 25.) If thou intendest me herein, thou hast taken wrong measures, and hast given me Scurrillous and Abusive Characters; and then thou art grosly mistaken in thy judgment, *That I thirst after such ignorant Subjects*, as thou importest. The Lord hath raised me up to open peoples Eyes, and to turn them from Darkness to Light; and God, the Righteous Judge, who knows my heart, and whom I serve with my spirit in the Gospel of his Son, he knows 'tis my delight in Humility, to serve him therein, and to see People turned from Darkness to the true Light, and from their Ignorance and Error to the knowledge of the Truth in the spirit and power of it in themselves, that they may walk in the Path of Life, and be saved; and no otherwise to follow me, than as they may see me walk therein. So knowing my

Integrity and Humility in the ſight and preſence of God, who hath thorowly ſearched and tryed me, that I affect neither Popularity nor Greatneſs, I do the leſs value thy Reproaches, and all the bitter Invectives that thou canſt bring forth againſt me. My innocent Life reigns over thy hatred, and ſhall out-live thy envy and ſcorn.

And as thou haſt laid a falſe foundation againſt the Pen-man, as judging him a *Perſon thirſting after ſuch ſort of ignorant Subjects*, as before related; ſo thy Superſtructure raiſed by ſuppoſition is impertinent, trifling and fallacious. For,

1*ſt*, Where have any of us (whom thou ſmiteſt at) either from a Meeting yearly, or elſe-where, in giving forth (as thou calleſt them) certain *Sentences*, *Decrees* and *Orders* (directed to the reſt of the People called *Quakers*) therewith ſignified to them, *'Tis your Duty to ſubmit, whether you ſee it your Duty or no?* p.45. I am ſure, this is forreign to my (and my Brethrens) Language and Intention. If it intends an active Obedience before men ſee their real duty, which none can acceptably perform, nor is it my Principle to urge them upon practice until their Eyes be opened to ſee their duty therein, yet peoples preſent Ignorance of their Duty (when propoſed or told them in the ſpirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt) is no warrant

warrant for them to *oppose*, *refuse*, *resist* or *reject* it, but rather tenderly and quietly to weigh & consider of it before the Lord, and wait in his Light till he reveal it, resolve the doubts and remove the scruples.

2*dly*, Moreover, that which hath a tendency to Confusion, Rebellion and Ranterism, was thy undervaluing the Authority of the Church of Christ in such a *Judgment or Decision* given thereby as proceeds from the Spirit of God, (for 'twas no other that *R. B.* argued for in the case) by thy pleading (in opposition) *for leaving a liberty therein for a Believer to refuse to submit on the account of not seeing it his duty to submit*, with other circumstances of Looseness and Confusion, proceeding from thy opposite, loose confused Spirit of Prejudice and Division: This has a tendency to *Confusion*, *Rebellion* and *Ranterism*, which we placed not meerly on a Non-submission or Forbearance of Practice, for want of seeing it their duty to act therein. For 'tis possible some Members may want a present sight in some things required by the Church of Christ and his Spirit, and yet they not thence allow themselves a liberty to *Refuse* submission, but rather to wait in their measures till God reveal his mind therein, in which cases there's a tender sence and forbearance one to another; and this does not pag. 45.

tend to Confusion, Rebellion or Ranterism; but thy plea for the leaving a liberty *for Believers to refuse to submit to the judgment and decision of the Church of Christ*, and for the same insisting on *their not seeing it their Duty to submit*, when the judgment of the Church of Christ, pleaded for on our parts, is no other than what proceeds from his Spirit, or Christ himself as being present in his Church. This thy Libertine plea tends to divide the Church of Christ, and to leave Believers, (who are Members thereof) in a liberty both of denying submission, and in an ignorance or blindness concerning what the spirit of Christ in his Church may require of them, which I cannot grant thee that any sincere Believer is either so to be left in such a liberty of *REFUSAL*, nor yet remains in such Ignorance; for he that will not hear the Church (where Christ is in the midst) is to be accounted as an *Heathen man*. Therefore thy Plea tending to divide and make Believers Heathen, is contrary to our Principle and Testimony received from the beginning, which is, *That Life answers Life: The Spirit of Truth receives its own in men; every living true Member in some degree feels what proceeds from its Life in other Members*, though all Christ's Members are not come to the same measure and degree of growth, strength and understanding, yet there's

there's ſo much inward tence and nearneſs in his Life and Faith, as preſerves them from Confuſion, Rebellion and Oppoſition to one another, or to any thing the Spirit of Chriſt ſaith unto the Churches by any of them.

Thy putting and ſuppoſing Caſes againſt us that are not, thy arguing from Generals to Particulars, from Principles to Perſons, from a Plea for the Church of Chriſt (and its obliging Judgment proceeding from his Spirit) to reflect upon particular Perſons (as the Pen-man and his Brethren, *John* and *George* and *Stephen*, &c. p 45.) are empty, triſling and impertinent, and as vain and ſilly is the *Laughter* and *Scorn* which thereupon thou ſuppoſeſt, and wouldſt ſtir up againſt the Pen-man, and his Brethren, all grounded upon a falſe bottom, namely, thy uncharitable and falſe ſence and cenſure againſt the Pen-man, *viz. That he is thirſting after ſuch a ſort of Subjects that may be willing to follow his Track, though they know not whether it be right or wrong.* Which is ſo utterly falſe (if thou intendeſt me) that ſuch a deſire never entred into my Heart; my Soul abominates ſuch a Principle as to lead People on in ſuch blindneſs. Again, I do not make the reaſon of my Diſcourſe depend on a *meer ſuppoſition*, not yet on a bear *affirmation*, that I and my Brethren are the *Church*, & thou and thine not; we are now on the defenſive part, pag. 45.

and thou art not able to unchurch us; we may give teſtimony of our Faith, and to our ſence of the preſence of Chriſt with us and among us, & of our continuance in Love & Unity in him, and againſt thine and others Apoſtacy, and thou not able to confute us. The reaſon of our *Diſcourſe* (in the preſent *Controverſie*) depends not on Perſons, but on undeniable Principles and Practices, agreeable both to divine Teſtimony, Revelation & undeniable Evidence amongſt men. And wherein any of us have been moved of the Lord in his holy zeal to give poſitive Judgment, either concerning Spirits, Perſons or Practices, that appear not yet ſo evident to ſome as to us, the day will make further diſcovery and declare it, and the Lord will appear witneſs and evidence in the caſe. And thou ſhalt then find, that thy Scorn, and the Laughter and Scorn thou haſt ſuppoſed (and ſought to ſtir up) againſt us, will be turn'd into ſorrow on thy part; and thou mayſt be aſhamed of thy ſcorn and laughter, and of comparing *our Treatment with the Papiſtical Parties towards the Proteſtants*, and telling of *following the Pen-mans Papiſtical Track*, p. 46. All grounded on thy falſe ſence before-cited, though to me all thy Scorn, Laughter, falſe Compariſons and *Rattles* (thou knoweſt what I mean) are all but like the Crackling of Thorns under a Pot. It's obſervable,

that

that in thy Epiſtle to the *Reader*, &c. thou art for *taking up a Lamentation for the Apoſtacy of your Brethren*, as thy pretence is: Now thou art for *Scorn* and *Laughter* againſt them thou ſo cenſureſt; yea, to the *Preſbyterians Laughter and Scorn* thou art expoſing *R. R.* and for thoſe Inſtances he gives for *Deconeſſes* in the Goſpel-times, p. 33. though this be a Truth, which many *Proteſtant* Authors have confirmed, beſides *Paul*'s own commendation of their Siſter *Phebe*, whom he called, Διάκονον, *Miniſtra*, A Servant of the Church at *Cenchrea*, *Rom.* 16. 1, 2. There were *Women-Deacons*, who in their places did ſervice in the Churches, with reſpect to the *Sick* and *Impotent*, &c. But to return, one while thou pretendeſt to pray for the Penman, *That the Lord would mollifie his hard heart*, p. 42. another while art for cauſing *Scorn* and *Laughter againſt him* [Thus but in pag. 46.]

Thus thy hypocritical Lamenting, Praying and thy Scorning do much reſemble thy confuſed Work.

And what ſuch things are they thou inſinuateſt againſt the Pen-man and his Brethren? Of which thou ſayſt, *Thou couldſt ſoon lay a new Foundation to prove him and his Brethren guilty of ſuch things, as by his Rule would tend to Confuſion, Rebellion and Ranteriſm, and what not?* p. 46. What things are thoſe? We expect no mercy nor favour

from thee; thou hast rendred us as obnoxious, I think, as of thy self thou canst. And this thy general and dark way of smiting (with *what things* thou couldst prove the *Pen-man* and his *Brethren* guilty of, as tending to Rebellion and Ranterism, without mentioning what things, is very unfairly to raise great suspicion against us, and to render us highly Criminal, Odious and Obnoxious, some-what like the Treatment we had in those Abusive, Scurrilous, Atheistical and Slanderous Pamphlets, stil'd, *The Quakers Quibbles.*

How now *William!* Is this thy *Conscience*, thy *Charity*, thy *Christianity*, thy *Love* pretended? and the end of thy feigned Lamentation and Praying for us, thus to abuse us, and cast dirt upon us, after this general implicit and suspicious manner? Is not such deceitful, injurious and contradictory Dealing rather contrary to common Morality and Civility amongst men?

Thy Prayer, conclusive of thy second Chapter, pag. 46. is mixt with as much Falshood and Envy (as the other stuff is with Scorn) in these words, *viz.*

The Lord preserve us all from following the Pen-man's uncharitable Papistical Track, lest thereby we should not only merit the Indignation of God, but justly be accused by men of understanding, of so much Delusion, Weakness or Wickedness,

Wickedneſs, as (conſidering our antient profeſſed Principles, and Practices) might render us unworthy the favour of a true Proteſtant, a deriſion to the Heathen, and a ſcorn to Fools themſelves.

I am ſure this Prayer appears not without Wrath and doubting; 'tis not offered in Charity, nor with Holy Hands; 'tis more like a *Cain*'s Sacrifice; 'tis to ſlay the Chriſtian and Proteſtant Reputation of him (and thoſe) thou writeſt againſt, to render him not only one that has merited the Indignation of God, but one in a Papiſtical Track, unworthy the favour of a true *Proteſtant*, and ſo obnoxious to the outward Penal Laws, ſeeing (by thy Words) *If you ſhould follow his Track, you ſhould SO merit, be SO juſtly accuſed and rendred*, as thy Prayer intimates. Herein thou doſt not only aſſume the place of a Judge over us (contrary to thy own Principle, eſpecially that in the Paper which thou haſt expoſed as *E. B*'s to *Judge no man under any Pretence whatſoever*) But alſo thou haſt ſet the Heathen to judge and deride ſuch among us as (in thy account) go from their antient Principles and Practices, and ſuch alſo to be a ſcorn to Fools. But muſt the Heathen and Fools be ſuch abſolute Judges in Church-Affairs, as over Apoſtates, &c? Why doſt thou then ſo much contend againſt and oppoſe *R. B.* for pleading

pleading the authority of the Church of Christ, as having power in some cases of Conscience to give *positive Sentence or Decision obligatory upon Believers*? Or why hast pleaded a Liberty for a Believer's refusing submission thereunto, on account of not seeing it his duty to submit? Must the *Heathen* be allowed a greater Power and Clearness in positive Judgment than the Church of Christ or Believers? But if the said Penman hath rendred himself *so deluded, so weak or wicked, so unworthy the favour of a true* Protestant, *such a derision to the* Heathen *and scorn to Fools*, as thou dost import. Then it must needs be a great undervaluing to such a great and popular Person of Knowledge and Parts (as thou wouldst seem to be) so much to trouble thy Head, and to spend so much time, toyle, labour and charge (as thou hast done) against such an inconsiderable, weak, mean, contemptible Person (as thou dost represent the Pen-man) yet *one whose writing doth not shew him a meer Fool*, (thou sayest) P. 45. It seems hee's one who is but a little wiser or better (in thy esteem) than *a meer Fool*. How lofty and high art thou? How conceited and wise in thy own Eyes? God will abase thee, I am perswaded.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

§. 1. W. R's *Trifling againſt the Pen-man about his own Conceſſions to Truth. His abuſe of the People called* Quakers, *as having ſuch kinds of Declarations, frequently publiſht among them as are unſound (and of a* Popiſh *tendence) about ſhutting out the Wiſdom of all kinds, without diſtinction, and his now mincing the matter reflecting about proving Negatives, and his ſhufling and ſhifting, on his not mentioning Time, Place or Perſons.* §. 2. *About his miſ-expreſſing himſelf, how it might be excuſable.* W. R. *can never come off clearly by thoſe Inſtances he gave in his Poſtſcript, to prove his proceeding to Print, Righteous. But his Fallacy ſtill remains upon him, in that his chief Inſtance of the printed Epiſtle of two Sheets, by* Anne Whitehead *and* Mary Elſon, *not Writ nor Printed till long after he had proceeded to Print; His Fallacy therein made more and more notorious* §. 3. *About the* Tree of Knowledge: W. R's *late Doctrine rendring* it good for Food; *but now denying that he has* written any thing *to ſhew his* own ſence either way. *His ſaying and unſaying, Fallacy and Impertinency*

nency apparent in this point. §. 4. *Of his straining* G. F's *Words* (*about ſetting up outward things*) *beſides his Intention*; *His groſs and reproachful Conſtruction*; *His dark ſmiting and ſuggeſtion againſt Preachers among the* Quakers, *to render them exalted and imperious Impoſers*, WITHOUT GIVING A REASON WHY, *&c.* §. 5. *His Story of Jealouſies being entred Thouſands againſt our travelling Brethren, and what Jealouſies incredible and unreaſonable.* §. 6. *About the Tree of Knowledge again, Whether* W. R. *eſteem it good for Food or not: He ſtill ſhifts and writes manifeſt untruth, in denying his own Words, to ſhew either oppoſition or aſſent to ſuch Doctrine* (i. e. *that 'tis good for Food.*) *His fallacious Evaſion and Impertinency return'd more home and cloſely upon him.* §. 7. *Concerning Tythes.* W. R's *late Objection and looſe Anſwer farther examined, and the tendency thereof* (*and of what he now further ſaith*) *for the Payment of* TYTHES FREELY *to the National Miniſtry, and now* to any uſe whatſoever, *without regard to humane Inſtitution or claim of divine Right. His Apoſtacy and evading our antient Teſtimony in this point; and his fallacious Inſinuations and Reflections made obvious.* §. 8. W. R. *cannot*

clear

clear himself of his Erronious Doctrine of Circumcision being a Christian Liberty, or in a Christian Liberty, &c. *which was a legal Bondage and Yoke, observed for a time in submission to* Moses's *Law, and not to* Christ's *Doctrine, wherein was a* Christian *forbearance, not* Christian *Liberty in the Practice.* W. R's *scorn and falshood about the LAITY, to render us* Popish, *&c.*

§. 1. TO thy occasion taken on the title *Disaffection* in the Contents of our Treatise [viz. *That if the Writer's words may be taken, to shew the meaning of his mind, then he is disaffected with thy very Concession to Truth*, &c.] pag. 46. cap. 3. This is meer trifling and idle. Those Concessions of thine to the Truth are so excepted, by being distinctly noted both in the Contents and Book, as being *Concessions to the Truth (in Confutation to thy self and much of thy Book)* which being thus plainly expresst by the Writer, thou canst not justly construe his Words, as shewing his meaning to be *that he is disaffected with such Concession to Truth.* This is an abuse to be sure.

Because that in our observation on the 5th *Disaffection*, we utterly denyed and judged as a falshood and abuse to the People

People called *Quakers*, thy saying, That *these kinds of Declarations frequently published amongst the aforesaid People*, viz. **Let us exclude the Reasoning, the Wisdom and the Jealousie, and let us have an Eye to the Brethren; yea, to shut out the Wisdom and Reason of All kinds, without Distinction,** [according as thou relatest in thy *Christian-Quaker*, part 1. Pref. p. 6. and p. 18, & 27.]

On our denying and judging this as a Falshood, and horrid Abuse and Scandalous, thou art pleased to reflect upon the Pen-man as very ignorant, *void of sound Argument, and Obnoxious to the censure of ingenious Readers*, as being *in his own sence capable to prove any sort of Negatives whatsoever*, p. 47.

That's a falshood *William*, the Pen-man hath no such sence: But by the way observe how unfairly thou art shifting here instead of proving thy Charge, *That these kinds of Declarations are frequently published amongst the aforesaid People called Quakers*. Now in thy last citation, where thou sayest, viz. *I intimate as if this Doctrine had been published amongst us, &c.* p. 47. Here thou mincest the matter, and leavest out the Words *frequently*, and *the said People*, which do render the Fact more notorious and general, and the more rational for us to deny it, and to judge it as thy gross abuse against the

said

ſaid People, which is not to prove any ſort of Negatives whatſoever; We firſt give our Negative to thy Charge in the terms of it, then our Judgment: It concern'd thee to make it good then, and not to put us off with Flams and Jeers; and now tell us, *Thou didſt not mention either Time, Place or Perſon*: At that rate it may be a hard matter to prove Negatives againſt thee indeed.--Though thy charge be never ſo falſe, ſo long as thou canſt prevaricate, and alſo vary the matter from a popular and publication, to a particular Perſon, Time and Place, (and neither tell us who, when or where) —as *FROM theſe kind of Declarations frequently publiſht among the People called* Quakers. *TO this Doctrine had been publiſht amongſt us*: Yet *I did not mention either Time, Place or Perſon*, p. 47. Like as to ſay, You muſt take all the matter upon my Credit: You muſt pin your Faith upon my Sleeve: If you deny and judge what I ſay as an abuſe, I have a cunning way to ſhift it, inſtead of making probation. I can tell you, I did not mention, Time, Place or Perſon: 'Tis void of ſound Argument for you to go about to prove any ſort of Negatives, &c. But *William*, this kind of ſhifting, and then retorting and ſcorning, will not gain thee Credit nor Reputation, in thy mean and feeble

attempts,

attempts to prove the People called *Quakers* frequently under such a kind of Ministry as is in it self (*Popish*, and tending to Introduce *Popery* it self ((according to thy own Inference) that is, *Ignorance instead of Wisdom, Bondage instead of Freedom in Christ, Ignorance as the Mother of Devotion, &c.* Answered in our Treatise, *ACCUSER*, &c. p. 6, 7, 8, 9. And not only so, but that some blind Zealots are Principled *to have an Eye to the Brethren instead of the Light in himself*; as in thy Postscript to thy *Christian-Quaker*. But we can as well and truly deny that such Declarations (as afore) are frequently published among the People called *Quakers*, and judge it a horrid abuse and reflection on the said People, as we can deny that Jesuits frequently Preach among them, which is also an Abuse of some, and which thy Charge resembles. And 'tis no absurdity to prove Negatives in some cases, either in Popular or Personal actions, if Testimonies of Eye and Ear witness may be of any Credit. As for Instance:

The *Question* was put to a Meeting here in *London* (the greatest part being antient grave Friends) Where ever they heard such Doctrine preacht among the People called *Quakers*, as, **To exclude or shut out Wis-**

dom

dom & Reason of all kinds, without Distinction, and to have an Eye to the Brethren, instead of the Light in themselves? And they never heard such Preaching, nor any such Doctrine preached among the People called *Quakers* at all, either in City or Country, much less *frequently*. And their (with many others) negative Testimony, may be of credit in this case, else how should we answer those that falsly accuse us with *Jesuits* frequently preaching among us, but by our negative Testimony from our certain knowledge of those that do preach among us, that they are no such? Put case any of our peaceable Meetings should by our Persecutors be charg'd with committing a *Riot* at such a time and place; We deny the Charge and declare it to be utterly false, and produce evidence and proof sufficient and credible, (in contradiction to it) that our Meeting at such a time and place was in a peaceable posture, and nothing of violence or hurt done, offered or threatned, *&c.* Here we prove a Negative, that our Meeting was *no Riot*, by proving the Affirmative, that it was *Peaceable*. And what's frequently preached among us in our publick Meetings is as publick as they. And set case a Person be falsly accused for committing

mitting *Burglary* at such a time and place, and he produces sufficient Evidence, that he lodged at an Inn twenty or thirty or forty Miles off at that very same time when the fact was done. Here he proves a Negative, *i. e.* that he did not commit the fact.

§. 2. To thy saying, viz. *If in his sence I mis-express my self, then my meaning shall not be taken to excuse the defect*, p. 47. That's not true; for wouldst thou be so low in thy Mind, and so ingenious as either to confess such mis-expressing or defect, where we meet it, and clogg thee with it in thy writings, and not be tenacious therein, it would the more excuse thee, and shorten the Debate.

I do not at all find, that thou canst come clearly off, as either a just or righteous man in thy Allegations and Instances in thy *Post-script*, for thy proceeding to print and publish thy great Book, by thy principal instance of the printed Epistle of two Sheets by *Anne Whitehead* and *Mary Elson*, which thine (when nigh printed) did occasion; for that could not be the occasion of thine, when 'twas not in being till thine was almost finished in the Press. Thou produceſt no Plea to clear thy self, but what's presupposed, anticipated and waylaid in our said Treatise, pag. 26, 27.

However,

However, by thee impertinently ſlighted as *Impertinent*. That the ſaid Epiſtle was thy principal Inſtance for thy ſo proceeding, is no *falſe Aſſertion*, as thou wouldſt make it, is evident from thy own account, on which 'tis grounded: The matter is fully evinced in our ſaid Treatiſe, under the tenth *Diſaffection*, from page 19, to pag. 37.

Thy alledging, *Thou only aſſertedſt* Promulgation *of the ſaid Epiſtle, to ſhew that they were the firſt Publiſhers in Print, but not the firſt Printers.* Of what? That there are Diviſions, &c? This will not clear thee, nor evince thy Righteouſneſs in proceeding to print and publiſh thy Book, on thy Inſtance of the ſaid Epiſtle of two Sheets, which on this occaſion was chiefly thy concern to evidence and mention, and that in purſuance of thy own Juſtification, to prove thy Righteouſneſs in proceeding to Print, which the other Inſtances given by thee (about the publication of Diviſions by Declaration by Manuſcript) do not anſwer nor ſeem to parallel, but that chief one of *Printing*. And what? the ſaid printed Epiſtle of two Sheets, though the greateſt part of thy great Book was printed before that was writ? To thy now confeſſing, *That they* (i. e. *Mary Elſon* and *Anne Whitehead*, &c.) *were the firſt Publiſhers in Print, but not the firſt Printers.* Then their

Publication could be no juſt plea nor inſtance for thy proceeding to Print, as thou didſt. Thy not being the firſt Publiſher, but they, does neither excuſe thy intention as Righteous, nor thy act of firſt Printing: 'Twas the bulkineſs of thy Book that prevented its firſt Publication, and the ſmallneſs of theirs (though not writ till after a great part of thine was printed) that did expedite its publication.

Thy ſaying, *Thou only aſſertedſt Promulgation of the ſaid Epiſtle*, is an evaſion: 'Twas in purſuance of thy pretence of Righteouſneſs in thy proceeding to Print, as well as to promulgate or publiſh thy Book of Diviſions, that thou gaveſt that inſtance of the ſaid Epiſtle being printed. And as a ſupplement in thy *Poſtſcript*, to what thou hadſt writ in thy *Preface* and *Introduction* (which thou judgedſt *might give ſufficient ſatisfaction to every Impartial Reader*) *but leſt the Ignorance of any ſhould be ſo great, as not from thence to perceive the Righteouſneſs of thy proceeding to Print*, they might by theſe Inſtances in thy *Poſtſcript*, which therefore relate to the ſame proceeding that the *Preface* and *Introduction* do: See, the caſe is plain, 'tis no evading it. Therefore thou appeareſt not ingenious in thy Allegation, viz. *He repreſents not the ſtate of the caſe aright; for my own words were theſe*, viz.

My

My Preſent proceeding to Print (the word [Preſent] *they leave out) which could not relate to any thing more than the* Poſtſcript, *becauſe the very* Poſtſcript *informs the Reader, that* All *the Treatiſe, excepting the* Poſtſcript, Index *and* Errata, *was then printed*, p. 49.

This will not render thee either a ſincere or juſt man in thy proceeding (*William*) we do not leave out the word *Preſent* in the citation of thy words; for 'tis incerted in our citation of thy own words, relating both to thy *Preface*, *Introduction* and *Poſtſcript*, all alledged for thy preſent proceeding to Print, and to evince the Righteouſneſs thereof; And thou knoweſt in thy own Conſcience, that either thy Word [*PRESENT*] muſt relate to more than thy Poſtſcript, or elſe thou waſt very Impertinent and defective. If when in a Poſtſcript, by additional and ſupplemental Plea or Reaſons to all that precedes in thy *Preface*, thou art going about to make out the Righteouſneſs (pretended) of thy preſent proceeding to Print and publiſh Diviſions; we muſt thereby underſtand it *not to relate to any thing more than thy Poſtſcript*. Then we muſt take thy meaning to be, as if thou muſt have more plain and convincing Reaſons for thy proceeding to Print thy Poſtſcript of but four Sheets, than for all the reſt of thy Book of

near four score Sheets. And yet the plea in thy Poſtſcript appears to ſupply what thou haſt ſaid in thy Preface, in Vindication of thy publiſhing in Print thy Hiſtorical Relation, or great Book of Diviſions. I cannot perceive that thou haſt herein writ either Ingeniouſly, Conſcientiouſly or Conſiſtently. And thou mighteſt have ſeen how thou waſt aforehand obviated, which might have prevented thy preſent impertinent Excuſes and vain Allegations, if thou hadſt but taken ſerious notice of the following recited paſſage in our Treatiſe, *viz.*

"And further, If to evade the charge of "Fallacy and Injuſtice, De-
Accuſer, &c. p. 26, 27. "ceit and Falſe cover laid on "*W. R.* in this matter, he flies "to his Grammatical ſence of his Words, "and pleads his Intention, &c. as thinking "himſelf ſafe in both.

"1ſt, We ſay, *His preſent proceeding to* "*Print* cannot in reaſon be confined to his "Poſtſcript, wherein the Words are, nor "anſwer the *SOME* of the People called "*Quakers* he tells of, that have judged him "wicked, as for intending to Print againſt "Friends, *Poſt.* p. 25. (whom he under-"takes to anſwer in that caſe) nor vindi-"cate him as to his Hiſtorical Relation, "(mentioned in the ſame page) which "includes

"includes his Book, which therefore can-
"not be confined to, nor included in his
"Poſtſcript.

"2*dly*, The Reaſons he gives in his Poſt-
"ſcript, to prove himſelf Righteous in his
"proceeding to Print, cannot relate only
"to that his Poſtſcript, but to his whole
"Book, becauſe they are added for a ſup-
"plement to his Preface to the Reader, and
"his Introduction to the firſt and fourth
"parts of his Treatiſe; which Preface and
"Introduction concern his whole Book
"or Hiſtorical Relation (as he calls it.)
"And which Preface and Introduction he
"thinks may give ſufficient ſatisfaction to
"every impartial & unprejudiced Reader:
"*But leſt the Ignorance or Blindneſs of any*
"*ſhould be ſo great, as not from thence to per-*
"*ceive the Righteouſneſs of his preſent proceed-*
"*ing to Print*, &c. he gives his additional
"Reaſons and Inſtances in his Poſtſcript;
"the chief whereof is that relating to the
"two printed Sheets, which came to his
"Hands the 8th of *November*, 1680. as
"aforeſaid, wherein the ſupplemental
"Reaſon given, was more clearly to evince
"the pretended Juſtneſs of his proceeding
"to Print, than he had done before in his
"ſaid Preface or Introduction, as that it
"was even to prevent ſuch great Igno-
"rance and Partiality as would hinder any

"from perceiving his Righteouſneſs in pro-
"ceeding to Print. [which therefore muſt needs relate to more than his Poſtſcript.]

And *William*, I find no Contradiction, as thou accuſeſt, between our ſignifying, That the two Sheets aforeſaid was *the Principal Inſtance* for thy proceeding to print and publiſh thy Book, (that is, to prove thy Righteouſneſs pretended therein, as 'twas made appear from thy own Words) AND ſignifying that thou declaredſt a far higher neceſſity, i. e. *a great concern of Conſcience*, &c. That the Epiſtle of two Sheets, aforeſaid, was thy principal Inſtance, Reaſon or Allegation, to prove the Righteouſneſs (pretended) of thy proceeding, is no down-right falſhood (as thou falſly rendereſt it) but true; for 'twas *CHIEFLY thy concern* to give that Inſtance of the ſaid Epiſtle after other Inſtances of leſs concern, and leſs to the purpoſe of *Printing*, &c. And that thou alſo placedſt a higher neceſſity on thy proceeding, than the ſaid two Sheets, is alſo true: The firſt was produced as a principal inſtance or cauſe, to evince the Righteouſneſs of thy proceeding to print an *Hiſtorical Relation*, &c. The ſecond was thy own Aſſertion for the neceſſity of thy proceeding, pretending it for the clearing of thy Conſcience, &c. Such *neceſſity* (pretended) of proceeding

was

was higher than thy ſaid Inſtance or Reaſon for it, as between an Immediate neceſſity of doing a thing, and an outward Reaſon or Inſtance for doing it. Where's now the Contradiction? If there be any, it muſt be thy own, in placing ſuch occaſion on the ſaid two Sheets, as to be *ſo chiefly* concern'd at them, and yet a more immediate neceſſity of Conſcience, &c. before that. The Premiſes of this point conſidered, in reference to thy being ſo *chiefly* concerned, to inſtance the ſaid Epiſtle of two Sheets, thy Charge that *a down-right Untruth is the Subject occaſioning his Words*, p. 49. (which thou calleſt *Drollery*) falleth to the Ground as a down-right Falſhood. That which thou calleſt *Drollery* (in concluſion of that Detection we made of thy unrighteous and fallacious Vindication of thy proceeding to Print, &c.) I am perſwaded it hit thee, and touched thee, as in a way of anſwering a Fool (that is, ſuch a one as is highly conceited, and wiſe in his own Eyes) according to his Folly. And how natural and ſuitable that paſſage (thou calleſt *Drollery*) is to the ſubject and occaſion given on thy part, unto which it relates, I leave to the impartial and ingenious Reader to conſider and judge, upon peruſal of the whole matter concerning that point, as 'tis handled in our ſaid Treatiſe, entituled, *The Accuſer*

ser of our Brethren cast down, under the 10th *Disaffection*; from p. 19. to p. 37.

Unto all which (*William*) thou hast but given an Impertinent *Fling*, and the slie *GO-BY* to the substance, even the most part thereof.

§. 3. Whereas upon thy Confusion and Contradiction to many Friends about the *Tree of Knowledge*, that God forbad Man to eat of: The Question was put concerning thy self, thus, *viz.* What kind of Preacher would he make, if he should tell People, *The Tree of Knowledge is good for Food; the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food?* This Question thou takest to be *grounded on a down-right Falshood*; for sayest thou, *I never asserted that the Tree of Knowledge was good for Food, and that it was not good for Food; neither have I written any thing to shew my own sense either way*, p. 50.

No! That's strange; and a gross and manifest Untruth and Shuffle, I am sure: And I may ask thee, if thou hast not belyed thy own Conscience in these Words? How darest thou now utter in Print, that thou hast not written any thing to shew thy own sence either way, *i. e.* Whether the Tree of Knowledge be good for Food, or not good for Food? Hast thou not (in the first place) written to shew thy own

sence

ſence, *That it is good for Food*, by thy plainly oppoſing the contrary Doctrine, as preached by divers among us: (*viz.* That the Tree of Knowledge was not good for Food.) Haſt not thou plainly *objected* againſt this Doctrine? Inſtancing, *That a Father may command his Child not to eat an Apple; his Rebellious eating no Argument to prove the Apple in it ſelf not good for Food: And we know not on what Foot of Truth any one can aſſert that the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food.* And to prove the Tree of Knowledge in it ſelf good for Food, thou alſo didſt cite *John* 17. *This is Life Eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Thence inferring, *ſo that Knowledge is the way to Life.* But did God forbid the knowledge of himſelf, and of his Son, to Man in Innocency, when he forbad him to eat of the Tree of Knowledge? Didſt thou not here plainly enough ſhew thy ſence, *That the Tree of Knowledge was good for Food?* And doth not this imply that the Serpent was more kind to Man in moving to eat of it, than his Maker was in forbidding him? There's no need of thy adding [*as in it ſelf*] for the Tree *is it ſelf.* With what Conſcience then durſt thou adventure not only to ſay, *Thou never aſſertedſt that the Tree of Knowledge was good for Food*, but alſo, that *thou haſt*

haſt not written any thing, to ſhew thy own ſence either way. Oh, wonderful! I ſomewhat admire at ſuch a manifeſt groſs Untruth, that thou ſhouldſt undertake in ſeveral Pages, with ſeveral Objections, to oppoſe a Doctrine, as thou didſt that of *the Tree of Knowledge not being good for Food*: And now to ſlam us off, with telling us, That *thou haſt not written any thing to ſhew thy own ſence either way?* Haſt thou not here play'd Legerdemain, to write ſo plainly in oppoſition to another's Poſition, and yet tell us, *Neither haſt thou written any thing to ſhew thy own ſence either way?* For ſhame leave off ſuch Impertinent Scribling, and ſpend thy time better in the Creation. But yet what reaſon for the Queſtion, viz. *What kind of Preacher wouldſt thou make, if thou ſhouldſt tell People, the Tree of Knowledge is good for Food, the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food?* For the firſt, thou haſt ſhewn thy ſence plainly, however thou wouldſt now ſmother it: The latter appears deducible from thy finding out a *Salvo*, or Plea, for ſome that may declare, *That the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food; for thou wouldſt not be underſtood to reflect on all that have uſed that Expreſſion, becauſe thou queſtioneſt not but many have ſo expreſs'd themſelves --to ſhew that if we ſhould feed upon, or admire any excellent Qualification or Endowment,*

dowment, and not have the Eye of our mind Chiefly unto the Giver, we might then come to a loſs; See the Second Part of thy *Chriſtian-Quaker*, p. 28, 29. Thus haſt thou excuſed the Doctrine before oppoſed by thee, viz. *That the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food.*

§ 4. As for *G. F*'s Epiſtle againſt the envious Spirits, and Perſecutors of thoſe who could not obſerve their outward Things, Traditions, &c. thou doſt much inſiſt on theſe Words, viz. *They that do ſo*, viz. *ſet up outward things, gather People to themſelves, not unto God, &c.* If theſe be truly cited, *G F.* beſt knows his own Intention, and in point of Juſtice ought rather to have been enquired of, as to have been his own Interpreter, than to have been brought forth in Print under the diſguiſe of a prejudicial Interpretation and ſtraining his Words, and turning his ſence beſides whatever was intended in them, or by him. And what haſt thou got by the ſaid Citation, thou haſt ſo much inſiſted on? If thou ſtraineſt the Litteral ſenſe thus, *That no outward things are to be ſet up, nor outward Order practiſed in the Church of Chriſt.* Thou wilt therein farther interfer with thy ſelf, having already granted outward Form and Order, &c. to be in the

the Church of Christ, yea, even the case of Marriage; as what care thou tookest about the marrying thy two Daughters, &c.

But *G. F's* intention and sence in the words of his said Epistle, is by another hand fully spoken to, and therefore I forbear enlarging on them. However thy construction, That *out of* G. F's *Mouth he and his Brethren may justly be compared to* Cain *for persecuting their Brethren, for no other cause than for not submitting to outward things*, &c. p. 50.

This Construction I look upon to be very gross and reproachful, and that it proceeded from a persecuting spirit, that is, a false and unjust Judge.

And as false and malicious (*William*) is thy dark smiting, in telling *of such sort of Preachers, (i. e.* among the People called *Quakers) whose Pride and Insolency might prompt them at this day to say,——Though you are our Witnesses, that we have often declared that our Commission from God was to turn People from the Power of Satan to God, that so they might all come to be ordered and governed by the appearance of the Power in themselves; yet we did* NOT *mean, but that when we had gathered any into the Truth, we should be those who ought to have the* RULE *over them, and that such should observe our Traditions, or follow us,* Without giving a Reason why;

and

and, though they might in Truth be ſubmitting themſelves one to another in the Lord (according to the Apoſtles Counſel) yet all of them muſt ſubmit to us, and reverence, honour and obey us, &c. pag. 50, 51. Thus far thou (*William.*)

But that any Preachers among the ſaid People called *Quakers* have ſo ſaid or preached after this exalted, imperious and inconſiſtent manner, I muſt take leave to deny, till I have better proof from thee, than thy quoting thy ſelf, or thy ſaying (that in the 48 & 49 pages of the 3d part of thy Treatiſe entituled, *The Chriſtian-Quaker*) *'Tis ſo written*, which is thy own Book, making thy ſelf thy own Authority proof for thy ſelf; and then thy ſaying, *'Tis as naturally deduced from* R. B's *diſcourſe in his Book of Government*; and then quoteſt thy ſelf again for Proof, bidding us *ſee pages* 41 to 49. in thy ſaid 3*d Part*. But ſtill, we deny thy Credit in the caſe, thou art no ſufficient Proof for thy ſelf againſt us; 'tis a meer begging of the Queſtion. The Pride and Inſolency thou wouldſt now fix upon *R. B.* he utterly denyes, as alſo, *That thoſe whom we have gathered to the Truth, ſhould obſerve our Traditions*, Without *giving a Reaſon why*. He alſo denys, that this is either naturally deduced or juſtly deducible from any diſcourſe of his in his ſaid Book. And I muſt

tell

tell thee (*William*) this looks like one of *Tho. Hicks*'s Abuſes and groſs Forgeries in his *Dialogues*; ſeeing it has always been our Principle to give convincing Reaſon, where ſcruples or doubts are, firſt to remove them, and clear Peoples underſtandings (ſo far as the Lord enables us) before they proceed to act in any Religious Performances; and we being the Servants of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we utterly abhor and deteſt ſetting up our ſelves *as Lords over God's Heritage*, or ſeeking to have the *Rule* and *Dominion* over them or their Faith; and we may each of us conclude, and ſay with his Servant Gideon, *I will not Rule over you, the Lord ſhall Rule over you*, Judges 8. 22, 23. 'Tis not Man, but the Lord we muſt exalt.

§. 5. Thou (*W. R.*) ſtill proceedeſt falſly and perverſly in ſaying, viz. *That Jealouſies have entred the breaſts of thouſands, that though theſe our travelling Brethren exalted the Spirit of God in man, as the only ſufficient Rule for man, and declared, that the Scriptures were not a ſufficient Rule to man; yet inſtead of leaving us to the Rule which they have declared to be ſufficient, they ſtrain that which they have declared not ſufficient, to make it (as much as in them lies) a Rule for them to rule over their Brethren*, p. 54.

To all which I ſay, 1ſt, We have no cauſe

cauſe to believe thy ſtory, that ſuch Jealouſies have entred thouſands. *2dly*, All travelling Brethren, approved among us, exalt the Spirit of God in man as much as ever. *3dly*, Such do not make the holy Scriptures (however truly own'd in their place) any ſuch Rule as for them to rule over their Brethren, ſuch being called to feed the flock, and not be as Lords over Gods Heritage, nor as ſeeking *Dominion* over their Brethrens Faith, but to walk in the Humility of Jeſus Chriſt, as Enſamples to the flock. Thy thoughts therefore to the contrary concerning thoſe who gave forth our Treatiſe, entituled, *The Accuſer, &c.* are utterly wrong; and thy quoting thy ſelf in thy ſaid *third Part*, is as feeble and impertinent as before in thy Forgery againſt *R. B. &c.*

§. 6. About the Tree of Knowledge again, thou (*W. R.*) again proceedeſt thus, *viz.* p. 51. *The* Pen-man *thus ſaith, By all this oppoſition to the Doctrine, That the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food,* William Rogers *ſeems to account it good for Food. Nothing ſaid by me, or cited as my words by themſelves ſhews either oppoſition or aſſent to ſuch Doctrine,* p. 51.

That's a manifeſt untruth again, and before detected: Many of thy own words cited in our ſaid Treatiſe, do plainly ſhew

thy assent to such Doctrine, and that thou accountedst the Tree of Knowledge *good for Food*, especially in thy opposing the contrary Doctrine. Review the Passage in thy own *Christian-Quaker*, part 2. p. 27, 28, 29. with our Answer, *Accuser, &c.* pag. 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114. and pag. 222, 223, 224. *If nothing said by thee, or cited as thy words, shew either opposition or assent to the said Doctrine; and that thou hast not written any thing to shew thy sence either way*, as thou hast declared, how hast thou pursued thy charge of *Apostacy* and *Innovation*? Didst thou not bring in that Doctrine (*That the Tree of Knowledge was not good for Food*) among other things to prove thy charge of *Apostacy* and *Innovation* against us, and this as to Doctrine opposed by thee? But now wilt not own either opposition or assent in any thing said or written by thee, to shew thy own sence either way. Oh *William!* where's thy Conscience, in writing not only thus insignificantly, but thus evasively and prevaricatingly? And how hast thou by such impertinency distinguished or proved thy self and party *The Christian-Quaker*, and those against whom thou writest *The Apostate and Innovator*, either in Doctrine or Practice, when thou hast attempted it in Doctrine? Thy attempts and opposition signifie nothing; thou hast not written any

thing

thing to ſhew thy ſence either way. Then thou haſt produced nothing to prove nothing.

To thy ſaying, viz. *If we had learned from the Scriptures, that the Serpent had ſaid, 'Twas good for food, yet it would not have ſhewn me erronious in my Aſſertion, unleſs the words* [as in it ſelf] *had been added, which are not*, pag. 51.

Thy Aſſertion! What Aſſertion haſt thou made in the caſe, when thou haſt not written any thing to ſhew thy ſence either way, either of oppoſition or aſſent to ſuch Doctrine, if therein we may believe thee? But how inconſiſtent with thy ſelf art thou, as between ſhewing no ſence, and thy Aſſertion in the ſame caſe? And what if the words [*as in it ſelf*] are not added, for *the Tree of Knowledge being good for Food, as in it ſelf*, as thou haſt plainly enough implyed? What would that have added to the *verity* of thy Aſſertion, or to the weight of the Doctrine, whilſt the Controverſie relates to *the Tree of Knowledge*, whether or no it be good for food, it relates to *it ſelf*, and not to another; for that Tree is *it ſelf*. However, thou mayſt intend, [*as in it ſelf*] to be *in its own Nature*, without reſpect to the Command.

The matter in Queſtion is not Whether the Tree of Knowledge be *good in it ſelf*,

but whether it be good for ſuch an end and purpoſe, as for *Food*, *i. e.* for the Soul of man, either before the Fall, or in the Reſtoration? Both God's Prohibition and Experience teach the contrary, *viz. That 'tis not good for Food*; though otherwiſe, Knowledge (rightly ſo called) be good as *in its own Nature*. But the *Knowledge* of *Good* and *Evil* is a mixt Knowledge, not Food for an innocent Soul; 'tis the pure unmixt Knowledge of the good only which ſprings from divine Life that is its Food. The words [*Tree of Knowledge*] are an alluſion, and is Myſteriouſly to be underſtood only in the Light of Chriſt.

To thy ſaying, *'Tis hard to know with what ſort of Spirit the Pen-man, moſt immediately concerned in the* Accuſer, &c. *is at unity with; For 'tis evident he doth not give the Devil his due, neither doth he give God or good Men their due*, pag. 52.

Is it hard to know? How cameſt thou then ſo ſeverely to cenſure and judge him and his Spirit, as *Impious*, *Wicked*, &c?

But in humility and fear of the Lord, he is at Unity (and daily converſeth) with the Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is a Spirit of true Underſtanding and Judgment, whereby he clearly diſcerns, and hath Power to judge thy dark, confuſed Spirit of Enmity, and its unfruitful Works

of

of Darkneſs and Diviſion againſt Chriſt and his true followers.

§. 7. Concerning *Tythes*, thou pretendeſt to except againſt the Payment of them, *That they are (as at this day paid under pretence of being Due, JURE DIVINO)—Antichriſtian*, and alſo againſt the *Humane Inſtitution and conſtraint* to pay them. [And thus far we do not oppoſe thee, nor have ſhewn diſaffection.] But thou haſt found out another and more eaſie way to pay them: Thus, viz. *Yet if any Perſon will FREELY of himſelf give a Tenth part of his Eſtate, or of the Increaſe thereof TO ANY USE WHATSOEVER; having no regard to any Humane Inſtitution or Claim by vertue of any pretended Divine Law, it can no more be called Antichriſtian then*, &c. p. 52. p. 52.

No! not as given to *any uſe whatſoever?* That's large and looſe, and as ſtrange! Suppoſe ſome do freely pay Tythes to maintain an Antichriſtian Miniſtry, without regard to the plea of *Jure Divino*, or humane Inſtitution or Conſtraint, but voluntarily and freely, which needs no conſtraint nor coertion: Were not this Antichriſtian? And did not the *Chriſtian-Quaker* bear Teſtimony from the beginning againſt the Antichriſtian Miniſtry and Tythes paid to maintain them, whe-

ther by ſome paid freely or not; the labour was to bring People from them to Chriſt, the great Shepherd, and end of the firſt Prieſthood, Tythes and the Law that upheld them.

Art not thou now evading and ſhifting from our firſt Teſtimony, that was abſolute againſt the payment of Tythes in theſe Goſpel dayes? And doth not theſe thy evaſive Apoſtatizing ſhifts tend to draw others into Looſeneſs and Apoſtacy, to decline the Croſs, and caſt off the Yoke of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt?

Again, thou giveſt a recital of thy Anſwer to the Objection or Queſtion of thy own framing, in the caſe of Tythes; but now craftily leaveſt out thy Objection, which concern'd Tythes, as given to the *National Miniſtry*, thus, viz. *But what if it pleaſe the Supream Power to beſtow on the National Miniſtry Tythes? How prove you from Scripture, that thoſe who freely pay it, do ill? or that 'tis not lawful for them, to receive it from ſuch?* Theſe are thy own Words, (*William*) to which thou madeſt the following Anſwer, mentioned in our 40th *Diſaffection*, and recited in theſe words, viz.

We are ſo far from condemning thoſe who freely pay them, (i. e. Tythes) *and not as by Con-*

Constraint, that we look upon it to be the Duty of all, professing Page 52. *Christianity, to contribute towards the outward Maintenance of such whom they usually hear, and account to be the true Ministers of Christ, though not obliged thereto by Law, in case they have need,* p. 52.

We remain still Disaffected with thy Doctrine it this point, (*William*) so far as it relates to the paying of Tythes: Thy granting an uncondemned Liberty therein, for them who can freely pay them to those they account the true Ministers of Christ (though they be the National Ministry) I am sure is contrary to the antient Testimony of the true *Christian-Quaker*, and all faithful travelling Brethren in the Gospel and Work of Christ, *To contribute towards the outward Maintenance*, &c. is not the matter under debate. But the Question immediately relating to the Payment of Tythes, as 'tis included in thy own Objection in the case, which thou hast craftily forborn to recite, and only reciteſt the Words of thy Answer; both being compared together, do more clearly evince thy Unchristian Liberty and Apostacy, in justifying Mens freely paying Tythes to those they count Ministers of Christ, &c. yea, though it be to the National Ministry, by thy Objection and Answer before. Thy

varying the Terms from [*FREELY PAYING them*] i. e. *Tythes*, *TO* a *CONTRIBUTING* towards their outward Maintenance, appears but a Prevaricating ſhift, and evading the terms of thy own Objection and Queſtion: Review the Point in thy own 2d Part, *Chriſtian-Quaker*, in granting a Liberty of freely paying Tythes to the National Miniſtry, without condemnation (as before.) Thou haſt contradicted *J. W.* and *J. Story*'s Teſtimony, viz. *As to Tythes, we can in truth ſay, 'twas never ſo much as in our Hearts to ſtrengthen any in the Payment thereof, nor yet to weaken the Faith of any, having a Teſtimony in our Hearts that Tythes, as at this day paid, are Anti-chriſtian.* Mark, [*as at this day paid*] is to the National Miniſtry; by ſome freely, and by others by conſtraint. As alſo thou ſheweſt thy fallacious Inſinuation and Prevarication, from the terms under debate, in concluding, *That the Pen-man would exclude ſuch ſort of Charity to any miniſtring Profeſſor of Chriſtianity, beſides ſuch as he may account of his own Brotherhood, whereby their outward Man might receive Suſtenance; elſe if they accounted it not Chriſtian-like, to give on a Charitable ſcore, TYTHES, without Compulſion; yet he might have ſhewn his aſſent that their Conſcientious Hearers might (without Condemnation) have adminiſtred in*

another

another Method, p. 53. How falſly haſt thou inſinuated againſt the Pen-man, and daubed with the Profeſſors, as if now thou wouldſt ingratiate thy ſelf, to come into favour with the Profeſſors, who are againſt the *Quakers*, and as if thou wouldſt pleaſe them, by telling *of giving on a Charitable ſcore, Tythes*. But *William*, I am ſorry thou ſhouldſt thus wrong thy own Conſcience, (by ſuch falſe Inſinuations) for therein thou knoweſt the matter in queſtion; and our Obſervation was not about (nor for) excluding ſuch ſort of Charity, as that of freely relieving or contributing towards the Suſtenance of the outward Man of any of them, in caſe of need; for that Humanity allows, much more Chriſtianity: But the matter in queſtion, was ſingly about the *freely paying of Tythes*, and that *to the National Miniſtry*, (as thy Words were) againſt which our *40th Diſaffection* was directed. And thy inſinuating expreſſions about *giving on a Charitable ſcore Tythes*, will not excuſe thee, nor clear thee in this matter; as alſo on this occaſion thou fallaciouſly inſinuateſt in thy Prayer, viz. *The Lord preſerve me and all true* Chriſtians *from that Cenſorious Spirit, as may conclude, that there are no other Sheep than of the Pen-man's Fold*, p. 53.

Whom doſt thou herein accuſe? We deny

deny any ſuch Cenſorious Spirit, with thy terms [*Pen-man's Fold*] for 'tis Chriſt's Fold we own. Thou art an uncharitable cenſorious Spirit. We know there are other Sheep, as Chriſt declared, which he will fetch home into his Fold: But thou appeareſt none of Chriſt's Sheep, either in his Fold, or out of his Fold, whilſt in ſuch an Envious, Wolfiſh and Scornful Spirit.

§. 8. Whereas to our 44*th Diſaffection*, about *Circumciſion* being a *Chriſtian-Liberty*, according to thy own Words; thou ſayeſt, viz. *Suppoſe I had in any part of my Writings laid down, that the practice of Circumciſion, by one that was a* Jew, *and a believer in Chriſt, was in that day a Chriſtian-Liberty: I only Query, (not intending to quarrel with my Adverſary about a Mode of Speech, when our Meanings are the ſame) How can this be termed an Erronious manner of expreſſion?——Why might not the Practice of ſuch a* Chriſtian, *be without offence termed Chriſtian-Liberty?* p. 54.

I Anſwer; Becauſe *Circumciſion* in the Fleſh, was not only a Type under the Law, but by *Chriſtians* counted a Yoke of Bondage, not to be born by the Diſciples under the Goſpel, being alſo among other Types aboliſht by Chriſt in his Sufferings and Death:

Death: Though ſome weak Believers, as thoſe of the *Jews* did for a time practiſe it; yet they did it in obedience to the Law of *Moſes*, and the Old Covenant; and not in obedience to Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the New Covenant: And there was a Chriſtian-forbearance and patience towards them, in ſuffering Circumciſion for a time to thoſe of the *Jews*, when the Vail was not wholly done away, nor they come clearly to ſee to the end of thoſe things that were aboliſhed by Chriſt. (and yet no liberty nor way was given for them to draw others into it.) Whence it follows, not that *Circumciſion* it ſelf was *Chriſtian-Liberty, or practiſed in a Chriſtian-Liberty in that day*, but with reſpect to *Moſes's* Law; but the forbearance towards them was Chriſtian and tender. I am not willing to make much ado about this thy Mode of Speech; though I look on't to be an unſound and unſcriptural Mode. To thy ſaying, *Thou doſt not ſay, that Circumciſion practiſed as aforeſaid, is a Chriſtian-Liberty; 'tis the Pen-man's conſequence, &c.* What haſt thou ſaid leſs? Thou haſt told us of *theſe Differing Exerciſes IN A CHRISTIAN-LIBERTY*; When ſpeaking of *practiſing Circumciſion, keeping a day, abſtaining from eating Fleſh* amongſt the Primitive Believers; *That Chriſtian-Liberty,*

ty, &c. See thy own Recitation, p. 53. 7th Part. Circumcision then was one of those differing Exercises, which thou placest *in a Christian Liberty*, and which in thy next page thou termest *Christian-Liberty*, as before: And thou sayest, *If the mode of Speech be not pertinent to express the matter in hand——'Tis our own approved Language.* I think thou mistakest here, (*William*) and the passage thou citest out of *R. B*'s Book of Government, p. 63, 64. proves it not from these Words cited, *viz.* "There is a certain Liberty and Forbear-"ance also, &c. whereof we have the Ex-"ample of the Primitive Church——*viz.* In suffering Circumcision to the *Jews*. [Did he here term Circumcision Christian-Liberty? No sure, 'twas only permitted or suffered to them, as was the Observation of certain Dayes, and abstaining from Meats, which were not holden universally; but when laid upon others, then preacht down and reproved by the Apostle, *Gal.* 5.

Is there not a plain difference between *a certain Liberty in suffering Circumcision to the* Jews, and *terming it Christian-Liberty?* Is this the very same Language *approved by the Second day's Meeting* (as thou sayest?) p. 55. Sure thou art much out here, (*William*) to our saying, "That this man, "who

"who is thus diſcompoſed in his Work, "ſhould not have medled "ſo much with Points of "Divinity, which he ap- "pears ſo little skilful in: He dreams ſo much "of Liberty that he is greatly bewildred "in the management of it. Thou anſwer- eſt, *'Tis Language more like the proudeſt of Prelates, adorned with a pair of Lawn Sleeves, than an humble Quaker*, p. 53. To this add- ing alſo in p. 55. *Will not the impartial Reader hence be apt to ſuppoſe, that the Pen- man's deſign is to ingroſs diſcourſes of Divi- nity to himſelf and his Brethren, that ſo the Laity may believe nothing but* p. 55. *what proceeds from their Mouthes and Pens: If they ſhall complain, that this renders them guilty of groſs* Popery; *my counſel is, Let them for the future ceaſe giving occaſion*, p. 55.

This paſſage W. R. *hath Printed divers times over in his Book againſt himſelf.*

This Queſtion contains both ſcorn and falſhood, ſuggeſted againſt us, to render us guilty of *Popery*, as before is diſcovered: We have no ſuch deſign of engroſement, nor *Popiſh* diſtinction among us, as between *Clergy* and *Laity*; the Spirit of Chriſt, and true knowledge of Divinity, are not limitted nor engroſſed in the will of man, to Perſons; neither doth our reprehend- ing a diſcompoſed Perſon for medling in

things

things beyond his skill, prove us Guilty in these cases.

Again, *William*, thou proceedest abusively and falsly in these Words, viz. *For 'tis well known, that* G. Fox *his party have been so Contentious, as that nothing would content them but the introducing new Practices, under the Notion of Gospel-Discipline, in a Spirit of Strife and Contention, concluding all to be dark that saw not with their Eyes,* p. 55.

P. 55.

I shall say little to these Reproachful Censures. But the Lord rebuke this false, malicious, censorious, judging, exalted, conceited Spirit: And he will manifestly rebuke it, I doubt not.

CHAP. VI.

§. 1. *Of our* Catalogue *of some of* W. R's *manifest Falshoods, notorious Slanders, scandalous Abuses,* &c. *(which are numerous) to clear himself, and prove the Penman to have play'd the Forger: He gives only three Instances, whereby* W. R. *cannot clear himself.* §. 2. W. R. *again opposing the Credit of the Pen-man's method about proving Negatives: The supposed Absurdity and Immorality removed.* §. 3. *Concerning*

cerning his Contradictions: His attempts only to reconcile the first Instance, proved invalid, as between his placing the Disunion in Principles, Doctrine and Life of Christianity, and placing it not in Principles of Truth, nor in Christ's Doctrine, but in Ceremonies, the Shell, &c. §. 4. His own Affirmation to clear himself of Contradiction, no valid Plea or Argument. His own dishonesty and injustice in accusing the Pen-man, for not informing the Reader what is right and what is wrong in the matter of Contradiction. His notorious Falshood and Contradictions farther pursued (in judgment against himself, on his own Censure) about the Apostacy entring the generality. Christ's words, Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17. Circumcision: *The* Tree of Knowledge: Freely paying Tythes, &c. §. 5. W. R's Postscript *a slight and scornful* Put-off *to our Friends of* Bristol, *their Book entituled,* An Exalted Diotrephes Reprehended; *his miserable Evasion, manifest Fallacy, Falshood, Abuse and Scorn against them, detected.* §. 6. *Of his Proposition to our Meeting in London. His Insincerity, unrighteous Judgment and Conclusion against our Meeting.*

§. 1. But let's see how thou *(W. R.)* proceedest to prove the *Pen-man* to have play'd

play'd the Forger in giving a *Catalogue* (term'd) *of ſome of* W. R. *his manifeſt Falſhoods, notorious Slanders, ſcandalous Abuſes, Perverſions, Rayling, Scoffing, Flattering and Reviling, in the 4th and 5th Parts of his Book, againſt* G. F. *and others, in his own words and terms*; which may be ſeen at large in our ſaid Treatiſe, *Accuſer, &c.* from page 230, to pag. 255, &c. how not only ſome of his manifeſt Falſhoods, Slanders, ſcandalous Abuſes, &c. are collected and ſtated in his own words and terms, but even all of them there collected, are ſo far from varying his own ſence, that his words or terms are ſcarce varyed in two of them. I find not his ſence or meaning in them varied or altered at all, ſo far as I can underſtand or gather.

Now (*W. R.*) in purſuance of thy charge before, thou engageſt in theſe words, viz. *I ſhall now proceed to cite only three Inſtances in one Leaf of their Catalogue, next to the Title,* viz. *One of their Forgery, another of their cript Citations, and a third of their cript and non-ſenſical Repreſentations of my ſound words, &c.* p. 56.

Obſerve by the way, That ſeeing the Inſtances are ſo few, as only Three (and though he calls them *only a taſte, &c.* p. 58) the Reader may preſuppoſe them to be (in his thoughts) knocking ones, or the moſt likely

likely for his purpoſe, and the moſt advantagious for his turn that he could find or pick out, and ſuch palpable Forgery, &c. as nothing to be ſaid for it. But ſee if it prove ſo; ſee if he knocks us in the Head or down with it: Now obſerve his great and chief Inſtance, *viz.*

They thus repreſent me to ſay in the Chriſtian-Quaker, *Part* 4. *pag.* 4. *That they are perſecuting Oppoſers who oppoſe* John Wilkinſon *and* John Story: *My own words are, Unleſs the Lord ſhall be pleaſed to change the hearts of the perſecuting Oppoſers of* John Wilkinſon *and* John Story. *This Forgery—to me appears to render me a Perſecutor; for, ſaith he, would* William Rogers *be counted a Perſecutor for his oppoſing others more vehemently? I abhor Perſecution, and in this Controverſie do act the part of a Defendant againſt (and in diſcovery of) a Company of* PERSECUTORS, p. 56.

Now let the Ingenious Reader obſerve, what great difference is there in thus repreſenting him? what variation of his ſence? as between his ſaying, *The perſecuting Oppoſers of* J. S. *and* J. W. and ſaying, That *they are perſecuting Oppoſers who oppoſe them?* I muſt confeſs, I am not ſo critical as to underſtand a variation of his ſence, or much of his words, in this ſmall Tranſpoſition, though he now makes his exception, *That*

there may be Oppoſition to each other, from difference in Religion, yet not attended with Perſecution. He ſhould have told us, that exception was included in his diſcourſe before in this point, *viz. That only ſome of the Oppoſers of* J. W. *and* J. S. *were perſecuting Oppoſers, but not all of them: Some of their Oppoſers are not Perſecutors:* But we muſt commonly be troubled with his colateral Meanings to ſupply his precedent Defects. But then, what *Company of Perſecutors* are thoſe he now tells of, againſt whom he acts the part of a Defendant? Are they not all he has written againſt in this Controverſie, both named and unnamed? And are not theſe the Oppoſers of *J. W.* and *J. S.*? Are they not thoſe whom he calls *G. F. and his Party, G. F. and his Brethren*? And has he not counted them *Perſecutors*, yea, *a Company of Perſecutors?* Who then are oppoſers of *J. W.* and *J. S.* that are not of party with *G. F.* (in *W. R.*'s account) and conſequently no Perſecutors? For *W. R.* ſaith, *G. F. and his Brethren (out of* G. F'*s mouth) may be juſtly compared to* Cain *for perſecuting their Brethren*, p. 50. And as plainly *W. R.* ſhews his meaning, and the intent of his words (before cited) where in page 22. in his compariſon between the Paper ſigned by *Charles Marſhall*, &c. and Pope *Leo* the tenth his Bull againſt *Martin Luther* (*Anno* 1520.)

1520.) *W. R.* ſaith, *But in the aforeſaid Paper there is no mention of any particular Doctrine or Viciouſneſs of Life, for which they* (*i. e.* J. S. and J. W.) *are perſecuted by their Brethren.*

Now wherein (I pray) is his meaning or ſence of his words (about *perſecuting Oppoſers*) altered, or the intent of his Mind *clouded*, (as he complains) in what we have repreſented? W. R. repreſents himſelf *in this Controverſie as one acting the part of a Defendant, only againſt a Company of Perſecutors.* But I am ſure he greatly acts the part of an Offendor and bitter Perſecutor, with his bitter words of hatred, to ſcandalize many innocent Friends, approved Servants and Miniſters of Chriſt among the People called *Quakers* with *Popery*, tending greatly to render that People obnoxious. Whilſt he is complaining of Perſecution, he's acting the part of a moſt bitter Perſecuting Informer and Incendiary. Apoſtate *Judas*'s are the worſt of Informers.

As for his Complaint of *cript Citation and nonſenſical Repreſentation of words*; I muſt ſay, and that according to my underſtanding, his words are ſo largely cited, as that the drift and ſcope of his Intention and Sence may be underſtood, though ſome of his long Parentheſis and ſuper-abundant Expreſſions are left out. I would not deſire

to be more largely cited by himſelf, or any Adverſary whatſoever, than he is in his words. And for my own part, I ſometime think that I am apt to cite my Adverſary's words too largely, but it is, that both his ſence may the more plainly appear, and what occaſion he gives, either for a judgment or inference naturally to be deduced. And I find not the Paſſage non-ſenſically repreſented, which he recites, pag. 57. But in that he calls the *cript Citation* (in the 6th line of the ſame page, I find his recital wrong, viz. *words* for *fruits*) But how can it be cript, when the page is quoted, where 'tis to be found at large?

Upon the ſerious peruſal of our Adverſary's reiterated black Charges of *Palpable Forgery and Prevarications*, pag. 57, 58. together with his attempts to prove them. I do ſolemnly profeſs in the ſight of God, I do not find my ſelf conſcious, nor juſtly chargeable therein; for I really am for giving the Devil his due, and not to overcharge nor miſcharge him in any caſe (how bad ſoever he be in himſelf) much leſs to overcharge my fellow-Creatures, how much prejudiced ſoever any of them be againſt me. Yet though I know my own Innocence, both as to Intention and Principle, I impoſe not my bare ſence and credit upon the Readers judgment, but leave him therein free,

to

to the light of Truth in himſelf, to take impartial and juſt meaſures in what he reads in this Controverſie, relating either to Perſons or Principles; and let the Light of Truth in all judge, for to that I appeal.

§. 2. To what *W. R.* ſaith of the *Penman's* Method, *If it ſhould become of Credit, 'twere then eaſie to undertake a Proof of any ſort of Negative, &c.* pag. 58.

'Tis a Miſtake; for when I ſee a Perſon fearing God abuſed, ſcandalized, defamed and miſ-repreſented, contrary to his known Principle and Practice (as I am really ſenſible and ſatisfied in my judgment, thou *W. R.* haſt frequently dealt by *G. F.* and others) I may give my poſitive Teſtimony and Judgment againſt ſuch abuſive and malicious Treatment, and yet not undertake a Proof of any ſort of Negative; and then it concerns thee *W. R.* to make Proof of thy Charges and Accuſations, when they are either denyed, or a negative Teſtimony given againſt them; otherwiſe not to think thy ſelf ſecure by quarrelling with Negative Teſtimonies, which in many caſes are lawful and of credit, and not Unchriſtian, nor Immoral, as thou ſeemeſt to render them. Neither needed the *Pen-man* therein to believe *G. F.* to be *God or Chriſt that never erred*, as thou falſly (by way of ſuppoſition)

argueſt, pag. 59. to render us odious. For if the Pen-man did but believe (as he doth) *G. F.* to be *a Servant of Chriſt*, or *a real Chriſtian*, or *a man fearing God*, he might reaſonably ſhew an utter diſlike of thy ſcornful Abuſes, Reproaches and Scandals caſt upon him, to render him as odious and obnoxious as thou canſt readily do in thy Books.

§. 3. Then as concerning the Contradictions, collected in our Treatiſe aforeſaid, from pag. 204, to p. 227. thou citeſt only the firſt Inſtance, and giveſt us thy bare Affirmation, *That the reſt are as groundleſs*, pag. 59.

The firſt Inſtance mentioned by thee is, BETWEEN thy telling of *ſo great a concern of Conſcience on many to encourage the Publication of thy Book, leſt it ſhould be reputed, That the Doctrine and Life of* Chriſtianity *were wholly extinct among the aforeſaid People.*

AND *John Wilkinſon*'s writing, That *of late dayes the Concord we once had ſeems much to be broken, &c.* And *the cauſe God hath manifeſted to me, That it is* NOT IN PRINCIPLES OF TRUTH, NOR IN CHRIST's DOCTRINE, *nor in any Practice which Truth, in the Members of the heavenly Body leadeth into; but about Preſcriptions—through the blind zeal of the weak*, &c.

Obſerve;

Obſerve; Hath not the one plainly here placed the *Apoſtacy* (charged) to be from *the Doctrine and Life of Chriſtianity*; And the other *not in Principles of Truth, nor in Chriſt's Doctrine*? *W. R.* as the great Aſſerter thereof, on behalf of himſelf and his party, and thoſe whom he writes againſt to be *Apoſtates and Innovators*; and not only ſo, but hath he not (in divers things) contradicted them both in matter of Doctrine and Practice in his Books?

Hath not the other (*i. e.* J. W.) placed the cauſe of the breach of the Concord, and of the Jarr, as *not being in Principles of Truth, nor in Chriſt's Doctrine, nor in any Practice which Truth leads into*? What's more plain than Affirmative in the one, and Negative in the other, on the ſame ſubject? Is not here a manifeſt contradiction *between* preſuppoſing ſuch occaſion of repute, as if *the Doctrine and Life of Chriſtianity were wholly extinct*; And, *The breach NOT in Principles of Truth, nor in Chriſt's Doctrine, &c.* The ſecond contradiction does alſo make it more plain, *BETWEEN* W. R. his placing the diſ-union *in Principles, Doctrines and Practices, and* his placing it in *Ceremonies, the Shell, not in Principles of Truth, nor in Chriſt's Doctrine*; See *Accuſer*, p. 206, 207. As alſo Between the words [wholly extinct among the

AFORESAID PEOPLE] and [*Through the blind Zeal of* THE WEAK;] for *the weak* among them, includes not *the ſaid People.*

But *W. R.* to ſave himſelf from a contradiction to *J. W.* in this caſe, pleads the different dates of their Words, viz. that J. W's *were written in the Year* 1676. *and* W. R's *in the Year* 1680.——and that *when Differences in the Church begin, they uſually aſcend higher and higher, and freſh and new occaſions, are often adminiſtred,* p. 60.

Here he ſeems hard put to it, yet this will not ſave him, nor excuſe him; for he knows that the ſame Practices and Doctrines, for which he has rendred many of the ſaid People *Apoſtate*, were in being among them before the Year 1676. as with reſpect to *Womens Meetings*, *Marriages*, *Tythes*, *Tree of Knowledge*, &c. As for *Prieſt and Profeſſor reputing or ſuppoſing the Doctrine and Life of Chriſtianity extinct or ſuffering Shipwrack among the ſaid People*, p. 60. *W. R*'s rendring many, or the greateſt part of them *Apoſtate*, was not the way to prevent ſuch Thoughts or Suppoſition in them, who were of the ſame mind againſt the *Quakers*, long before he writ, as being *no Chriſtians*, according as he has rendred many of them: Nor will the rudeneſs of ſome in the publick Meeting at

Briſtol

Briſtol (whether of his own party, or any others) prove a juſt occaſion of ſuch Repute againſt *the ſaid People* called *Quakers*, as his words ſuppoſe, without exception.

§. 4. Of the Catalogue of his Contradictions, *W. R.* again gives us his own *Affirmation*, That *not one Inſtance mentioned therein, as contradiction, will bear that term*; and then cryes out of *fallacious Prevaricating Inſinuations, &c.* p. 61. But would not *W. R.* have exclaim'd againſt this method of Writing in another (if againſt himſelf) as *Impoſition, begging the Queſtion, undertaking to prove any ſort of Negatives, and not to be credited?*

And now *William*, as for any of us *challenging a Meeting with thee*, and thy proffering it *in the City of Briſtol*; and thy inſtance of *an incitement to a Friendly diſcourſe*, p. 61.

Thy Friendſhip being turn'd into Enmity, and thy Love into apparent Hatred againſt us (thy antient Friends) we have no ground to expect any Friendly diſcourſe from thee; thou haſt been ſufficiently tryed in that way: And 'tis not thy endeavouring to flouriſh, vaunt and boaſt it off that will either regain thy Repute among God's People, or reſtore that Friendſhip thou haſt extinguiſht on thy part, by thy ungodly

hard

hard Speeches and Writings, words of Hatred, Scorn and Pride, which thou appeareſt puft up withal.

One paſſage I may not omit, touching *W. R*'s contradictions, p. 62. in theſe Words, viz. *'Tis well worthy the Readers obſervation, that though the Pen-man adds in the Title theſe Words*, viz. [*with Queſtions, Notes and Remarks thereon*] *yet none of the Notes or Remarks do inform the Reader what is right or what is wrong, in the pretended matter of contradiction (more than in pag.* 228. *in theſe words, A plain Conceſſion to Truth. Now he ſpeaks like ſome Ambaſſadour of Chriſt) For the aforeſaid omiſſion I do not commend either the Honeſty or Juſtice of the Pen-man to me, or his care over the Flock.*

To all which I Anſwer; 1*ſt*, This charge contains a notorious falſhood: 2*dly*, A ſelf-contradiction and judgment againſt himſelf. For *Firſt*, our ſence of *what is right and what is wrong* in his Contradictions, were not only declared in our Treatiſe in many things, before the Contradictions were ranked together, but alſo the Queſtions, Notes and Remarks upon them, do inform the Reader what is right, and what is moſt agreeing to our ſence as right, and what not. What we oppoſe, commonly is firſt ſet down in the firſt Column, and the better part in the ſecond, for confuta-

tion

tion of himſelf, as the nature of the Queſtions, &c. do evince plain enough to the Intelligent: As for inſtance, where *W. R.* is ſet againſt *W. R.* in his Contradictions; as BETWEEN his ſaying, *This Doctrine frequently publiſht among us* [*That the Apoſtacy ſhall never enter the generality more*] *doth give us juſt occaſion to be Jealous*, &c. Part 1. p. 14. *AND*, his ſaying, *I would NOT be underſtood to ſay, That the Apoſtacy ſhall never enter the generality again*, Part 3. p. 74. Our Queſtion on this contradiction is, *Q.* Then why does he ſo often quarrel with the Doctrine frequently publiſhed, as he ſaith, viz. *That the Apoſtacy ſhall never enter the generality more?* Which plainly ſhews, we own his aſſent to this Doctrine to be right, and not his Jealous oppoſition to it.

Again, to his Contradiction, in ſaying, *WE REASONABLY conclude, that the Words of Chriſt and the Apoſtle* (in *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17. and 1 *Cor.* 6. 1, 2, 4.) *ONLY hinted at Perſonal Offences or Differences, touching worldly matters*, Part 1. p. 47. And confeſſing (on *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17.) that *EVERY CASE, wherein one Brother may treſpaſs againſt another, may in RIGHT REASON be comprehended in it*, Part 3. p. 36. Our Queſtion on this contradiction is, *Q.* Whether *EVERY CASE* be to be limited

limited only to *WORLDLY MATTERS*, and not extend to any Caſes of a Spiritual nature? Which implyeth our accepting his aſſent to the latter, viz. *Every ſuch caſe*, &c. and not his limiting it only to worldly Matters.

Again, his placing *CIRCUMCISION as exerciſed in a CHRISTIAN-LIBERTY*; (and calling it *that Chriſtian-Liberty*) ſaying, *This did not at that time condemn that Chriſtian Liberty, in ſuch as made Conſcience of Circumciſion*, (which were ſome believing *Jews*) Part 3. p. 82. and Part 5. p. 74, 75. AND his contrary confeſſion, *That the Labour of the Apoſtles of Chriſt in the Primitive dayes, was to DRAW the outward* Jew *FROM OFF the obſervation of theſe Ordinances, which were really eſtabliſht by the appointment of God himſelf*, Part 1. p. 73.

Our Queſtion on this Contradiction, is, *Q.* How can it be good Doctrine to account *Circumciſion a CHRISTIAN-LIBERTY*, and an Exerciſe not condemnable in Believers, when the labour of the Apoſtles were *to draw* the outward *Jew from off* the obſervation of theſe Ordinances?

This plainly evinceth, that we do not own his Doctrine to be right, that Circumciſion was a Chriſtian-Liberty; though there was for ſome time a Chriſtian-forbearance towards

towards them that obſerv'd it, in obedience to *Moſes*'s Law in the Old Covenant.

Again, BETWEEN *W. R*'s oppoſing that Doctrine, *That the Tree of Knowledge was not good for Food, as not knowing on what Foot of Truth any one can SO aſſert.* And his ſaying, *I would not be underſtood to reflect on ALL, that have uſed that Expreſſion, viz. The Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food,* Part 2. p. 27, 29. Our Queſtion on this contradiction, is, *Q.* 1. If he counts the Doctrine erronious, or not of the Truth, to ſay, that the Tree of Knowledge is not good for Food; does not this reflect on all that have uſed that Expreſſion? And *2dly*, In commendation of the Tree of Knowledge as good for Food, as in it ſelf, he inſtanced *John* 17. 3. *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*; adding that *'Tis evident that Knowledge is the Way to Life*, Part 2. p. 28. Hereupon we put the Queſtion; *Q.* 3. Did God forbid the Knowledge of himſelf? the Knowledge which is Life eternal? that Knowledge which is the Way to Life, to man in the ſtate of Innocency in the beginning? Let this be conſidered. And, *Q.* 4. Can it be good Doctrine to ſay, That the Serpent perſwaded *Eve* to that Knowledge which is

is the way to Life, or to the Knowledge of the true God and Jesus Christ, which is Life eternal? Could THAT be the Knowledge that God forbad Man eat of? Were not this very absurd, to render the Serpent more kind to Man than his Maker was?

Is it not here apparent, that we have informed the Reader, that 'tis *not right* to esteem the Tree of Knowledge good for Food? As also on his contradiction in pleading one while *For* them who *Freely pay Tythes without constraint* (i. e. *to the National Ministry.*) Another while for J. W. and J. S. *Their Testimony against Tythes, as being* (*as at this day paid*) *Anti-christian*, Part 2. p. 43. and Part 4. p. 39. On which we observe and question, Whether the Liberty *W. R.* has here granted for the free payment of Tythes, be not an Innovation, tending to beget into a Looseness and Apostacy from our antient Christian Testimony against Tythes? And whether it be not contradictory to *J. W.* and *J. S.* their Testimony cited by himself? *Accuser*, &c. p. 224, 225.

What's more plain, than that his Liberty or Freedom granted for the payment of Tythes, is wrong and inconsistent with our antient Christian Testimony?

2dly, That *W. R*'s Charge before recited,

cited, contains Self-contradiction and Judgment againſt himſelf (though in it ſelf untrue againſt the Pen-man) is evident in his judging, that *his Notes and Remarks do not inform the Reader what is right, or what is wrong, in the matter of Contradiction* charg'd againſt him; and *for which Omiſſion he does not commend either the Honeſty or Juſtice of the Pen-man, &c. or his care over the Flock.*

Now though the Injuſtice and Falſhood of this Charge is already fully detected, obſerve how obviouſly *W. R.* hath hereby brought Judgment upon himſelf, concerning the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, to his being told, That he ſeems to account it good for Food. To this he anſwers, viz. *Nothing ſaid by me, or cited as my Words by themſelves, ſhews either oppoſition or aſſent to ſuch Doctrine*, p. 51. *Neither have I written any thing to ſhew my own ſence either way* (viz. *whether the Tree of Knowledge was or was not good for Food.*) p. 50. This is all one, as for *W. R.* to tell us, That he doth not inform the Reader what is Right or what is Wrong, in this matter of Controverſie; that is, Whether it be Right or Wrong to ſay, the Tree of Knowledge is good for Food?

If nothing writ or ſaid by him, doth ſhew his own ſence either way, he would be

be angry if I ſhould *make a Similitude Between him* and the Jeſuits, in his reſerve in this point; When they contend againſt the Opinions of others, but reſerve and hide their own: And if then it be both Diſhoneſty and Injuſtice, not to inform the Reader what's right, or what's wrong, in things contrary (as before intimated) then where's *W. R*'s Honeſty or Juſtice in this matter? How evidently is he here ſelf-condemned and judged? How manifold and numerous are his Contradictions! Now, *William*, conſider what Labyrinths of Confuſion thou runneſt into.

§. 5. And *William*, I cannot well but take notice of thy *Poſtſcript*, of ſomewhat above a Page, what a ſlighty Anſwer and ſcornful PUT-OFF it is. To the Book given forth by four of our Friends of the City of *Briſtol*, entituled, *An Exalted Diotrephes Reprehended*, againſt thy *Chriſtian-Quaker*, &c. in five parts. Inſtead of a ſolid Anſwer, or ſober Vindication of thy ſelf, from their Charge againſt thee, as being of an abuſive laviſh Tongue, of a rude, inſolent and imperious Behaviour in Men's Meetings, and ſpeaking prophanely of the Power of God: To theſe things thou ſayſt, viz. *All which I return as Dirt, unworthily caſt on me——Such their Calumniations are meerly*

meerly because of my zealous opposing them and others, &c. And then further sayest, *There are few men so weak, as (on serious consideration) to believe GENERAL CALUMNIATIONS against a man once well esteemed by the Calumniators: Let this be minded, and their Answer duely weighed, and then 'twill appear that nothing of weight in the said Book is written against me*, p. 79. [Thus far thou.]

Oh miserable Evasion, Fallacy and Falshood! with what Conscience couldst thou thus write, *(William)* as if their said Book and Answer consisted but of *General Calumniations* against thee, (What reason is there to credit thy general denyal?) which I am sure is a shameful and notorious Untruth. Take one instance out of many more, wherein they charge thee with particular matter of Fact, and that is about the Paper of Condemnation, or Submission, which was exhibited and owned by *J.S.* and *J. W.* at the Meeting at *Drawell* in *Yorkshire*, Anno 1676. when afterward they were minded to extenuate (or take off) the weight of it, not owning it according to the common acceptation of *A Condemnation*, &c. as the said Friends of *Bristol* relate: Hereupon they do particularly charge thee *(William)* about the same Paper, in these Words, viz. And *William Rogers*,

(who confeſſed *he drew it* for *J. S.* and *J. W.*) reported, *There was nothing in it, and that the moſt Innocent man amongſt us might own it, and never hurt himſelf, and that it was not better than a RATTLE to pleaſe Children*; See their ſaid Book, entituled, *An Exalted Diotrephes Repre.* p. 13. And not only in this, but in divers other particular matters they alſo charge thee home in their Book; and alſo ſignifie, that they do not think it neceſſary at preſent, to particularize thy prophane ſpeaking concerning the Power of God, no more than they have already done concerning thy horrible unſincere dealing with the Brethren at *Drawell*, &c. *Exalt. Diotreph.* p. 17.

Now (*William*) didſt not thou render thy ſelf horribly unſincere, in declaring the *ſaid Paper*, (which thy ſelf drew up) *no better than a Rattle to pleaſe Children*? after thou knewſt that *J. S.* & *J. W.* had tendered it *as ſatisfaction to their Brethren, and the Church of God in general* (as their own and thy Words are in it.) Didſt thou think to pleaſe thoſe Brethren, and the Church of God in general, with a Rattle for Children? Oh, *William*! was not this particular matter of Fact, and that very groſs and abſurd? How didſt thou reſemble the *Ranters* therein, and bewray great and horrid

horrid Deceit to have entred thee? I cannot in Charity think that the Devil had got so much hold of thee at that instant, when thou drewst up that said Paper at *Drawell*, as to intend it only as a Rattle to please Children; for thy own Narrative bespeaks better, and more serious things of Friends and Brethren, in their proceedings there towards *J. S.* and *J. W.* Surely then thou wast in a better and more serious and sincere mind at that time: But I rather think the Devil prevailed with thee afterward, after thou hadst eaten the Sop among the Disciples, and in the time of thy (and parties) discontented and murmuring Consultations, Satan entred thee, to devise that deceitful and Ranter-like cover and evasion of the said Paper, being but *As a Rattle to please Children*; Though at first tendred as Satisfaction to the Church of God in general.

Thus thy Fallacy, (in particular matter of fact) is detected, also in slighting and huffing off the said Friends Book, but as *General Calumniations, and therefore nothing of weight in it*; when there's such particular matter of notorious Fact charg'd upon thee in it, as thou canst not get over, nor acquit thy self of.

And what men are so weak (on serious consideration) as to believe thy general

Calumniations againſt either Perſons, People or Society, once well eſteemed, by thee a Calumniator? Or to eſteem thee and thy Abettors *The Chriſtian-Quaker*, and all whom thou calumniateſt to be *Apoſtates* and *Innovators*, according to thy Judgment? How wilt thou clear thy ſelf from a meer begging the Queſtion in both? which is never likely to be granted to thee as the caſe ſtands, according to thy own terms, and ſuppoſition caſt upon us for our owning our ſelves to be *the Church of Chriſt*, p. 45, 61. thou having been once in ſociety with us, and didſt well eſteem of us, but now not only gone out from us, but turn'd bitter Enemy againſt us, whilſt no probation made on thy part, either of our *violating* or *diſſerting* our firſt Principles of our Chriſtian Union and Society, which thy Brother *F. Bugg* hath moſt ſillily, yet maliciouſly attempted to prove againſt *William Penn*, *Stephen Criſp*, *John Burnyeat*, *Alexander Parker*, *Thomas Salthouſe* and *My Self*, from a Paper ſigned by us from a yearly Meeting, *Anno* 1675. wherein the ſence and tender advice of the ſaid Meeting is propounded in ſeveral matters of moment, *all which*, (in concluſion) *are recommended to the Evidence of Gods holy Witneſs in the Hearts of his People.* Where's now the *Impoſition*, *Antichriſtian Apoſtacy* or *Violence* done to

our

our first Principles of Union, charged on us by *Francis Bugg*, from this very Paper aforesaid, in his Book, *De Christiana Libertate?* *W. R.* dost thou allow of the said Paper thus recommended as a sufficient proof of the Subscribers Apostacy and Imposition? I am sure thou hast expresst the contrary. Now W. R. and F. B. clear your selves from *begging the Question*, if you can, by plain Evidence of your own *Christianity* and our *Apostacy*.

William, thou farther calumniatest and abusest our said *Bristol* Friends in thy Postscript, saying, R. V. *is known to be as fitte to go in the Second day's Meetings Errands, as an hired Apparitour is to go in the Errands of a Bishops Court.* And that R. S. *and* C. H. *thou takest to be fitly qualified, to say* ANY THING, *right or wrong to defame thee; accusing one of them with a Lying Spirit entred him*, p. 79, 80.

These Persons of *Bristol*, whom thou calumniatest are well known, both to their Neighbours and others, who I am perswaded will not give credit to thee therein. Thy scornful Invectives against them will go but a little way with those who know the honesty and good Repute of the Persons whom thou here writest against, and their deep suffering, with many more for Conscience towards *God*, which it appears thou hast little

little regard to, or sence of, who whilst they are suffering under strait Confinement and Duress in a Nacious Goal in the City of *Bristol*, for their tender Consciences (as they were when this thy Book (*7th part*) came forth, and as many yet are) thou art secure in a Corner, studdying and scribling against them, to calumniate and defame them in Print, as men of no Conscience towards God, *fitly qualified to say any thing, right or wrong, a Lying Spirit entred, &c.* Such is thy Treatment to the Prisoners of Jesus Christ, to add Affliction to their Bonds, and to make void their Testimony and Suffering for his Names sake. And not only thus, but thou art cruelly mocking, flouting and deriding at them, telling a story against one of these suffering Friends of *Bristol*, which thou sayst, *occasioned Derision and Laughter*; and that *by a Lying Spirit entred them* (thou sayst) *they may become a derision, both to Professor and Prophane, and a scorn to Fools themselves*, p. 80. No doubt thy scornful and malicious Work against them (though otherwise under Persecution and Suffering) and against many others fearing God, is to make them as ridiculous, and as much the Subjects of scorn and derision as thou canst; but 'twill all return upon thy own head, thou wilt reap the fruit of thy own doings. Thy pretended

Love,

Love, Christian Charity, Lamentation for thy Brethren, &c. (in thy hypocritical Epistle directed to the flock of God) go but a little way it seems; but that and other Instances of thy *Insincerity* and *Dissimulations* are numerous.

§. 6. And with what Sincerity or Conscience, couldst thou not only pretend an inclination toward an accommodation of the Controversie, but also propose to our second day's Meeting for thee *To read thy Answer, (viz.* thy 7th part, when in Print) *amongst us, and after so done to leave it with us,* and to pretend, *thy end was, that if the Meeting should that day propose any expedient, answering the Witness of God in thy Conscience, to stop the Publication thereof, thou should'st then answer the same by forbearing a further Publication thereof,* as in thy Letter, *dated, London, the 17th of the 2d Moneth,* 1682? pag. 80.

I do still question, with what sincerity or conscience thou couldst make such Proposition, and pretend such an end in it to that our Meeting, when thou hadst already prejudged the same Meeting in Print, as being *Apostate Innovators, &c?* What capacity could such be in to answer the Witness of God in thy Conscience, if apostatiz'd from it in themselves? And what ground couldst

thou have to expect ſuch a change in them from *Apoſtacy*, as that *Now* (when thou propoſedſt the reading thy Book) *they might be in a capacity to reach thy Conſcience*, as thou ſayſt? p. 82. Beſides, can any in reaſon ſuppoſe thee real or ſincere in thy Propoſition for an expedient to ſtop the Publication of thy Book of about twelve Sheets, when already Printed? Was not the deſign of thy Propoſition rather for a pretence to excuſe thy ſelf, and for a flouriſh over us, as thou haſt made an empty one, and what haſt thou got by it?

And was it not manifeſt, that thou waſt ſtill at leaſt jealous of our ſaid Meeting, as being *Apoſtate*, in thy not being free then to anſwer our three Queſtions, which were very proper, to try the reality of thy own Propoſition, and thy end pretended thereof, in order to our hearing thy ſaid Book read. The *Queſtions* were theſe, *viz.*

Queſtion 1. *Whether thou art ſenſible thou haſt done evil or hurt to Truth in the Publication of thy great Book, entituled,* The Chriſtian-Quaker diſtinguiſhed, *&c?*

Queſt. 2. *Whether thou haſt any better thoughts of our Second day's Meeting now, than thou hadſt when thou wroteſt that Book, as not now to eſteem the ſaid Meeting Apoſtate, &c?*

Qu. 3.

Queſt. 3. *Whether thou lookeſt upon the ſaid Meeting now in a capacity to anſwer the Witneſs of God in thy Conſcience?*

To which thou only gave us this return, viz. *I am not free to anſwer at preſent.*

Our Reaſon for the Queſtions was, That we might not ſpend our time in vain, or to no effect, in hearing thy Book read, which we ſhould do, if we ſhould undertake it, and have no aſſurance of thy having any better thoughts then of our ſaid Meeting, than to deem it *Apoſtate?* Or if thou didſt not then look upon it as capable to anſwer the Witneſs of God in thy Conſcience? To which thou not being then free to anſwer, we might very well then not be free to hear thy Book read among us, nor be ſo impoſed upon, as to ſpend our time upon ſuch uncertainty, having no probability of thy performing thy own Propoſition, with reſpect to the end propoſed, whilſt not prov'd ſincere or Chriſtian on thy part. Therefore thy Reflection upon our ſaid Meeting, and ſuppoſing us *like a Company of lazy or guilty Prieſts*, for our refuſal to ſuffer the reading of thy ſaid Book amongſt us, is both very unjuſt and ſcornful, and beſpeaks thy Lording Impoſing Spirit, thus infamouſly to upbraid us for not implicitly giving up to ſpend our precious time to anſwer thy prejudicate will and humour upon

upon thy reserved dark uncertainty. And also as a farther aggravation of thy Injustice and Prejudice, *thy taking our said Meeting's Treatment of thee on this occasion, to be an Evidence of our affection to sit on the Seat of Unrighteous Judgment.* This also is thy unrighteous Conclusion and false Judgment upon our affection, and is no ways naturally deducible from our forementioned Treatment of thee.

I have omitted many other Instances of thy abuse of Truth and Friends, leaving the righteous God to reckon with thee for all thy injurious dealing and hard speeches, as thou seemest to refer the *Pen man* to such a Reckoning, pag. 46, 63. The Lord awaken thee out of this hardened gain-saying state, and deliver them that are betray'd by the Enemy, and preserve his Heritage in love and peace over this scornful, exalted, conceited, crooked, quarrelsom apostate Spirit. *The Lamb shall have the Victory.*

CHAP. VII.

A Letter in Two Parts,

Which was ſent in Manuſcript to

Francis Bugg,

Except two Paſſages left out in favour to him, unleſs he will further expoſe himſelf to danger thereby.

IN the firſt part, his fraudulent dealing againſt Samuel Cater *about the* 15 l. *Fine. His Abuſes againſt him and others. His Conceitedneſs, Pride, Scorn and Shallowneſs are detected and reprehended.*

In the Second part of the Letter, relating to Francis Bugg's *Book, is evinced,* 1. *His unjuſt Reflection on the people call'd* Quakers, *and his being turned Informer.* 2. *His Judgment in eſpouſing and preſenting falſe Doctrine againſt the divine Light of the Son God in man.* 3 *His unjuſt Charge, and the collection thereof againſt certain Perſons among us by name, who are the Servants of Chriſt, and againſt our faithful Womens Meetings.*

Meetings. 4. *His Inſtances for Proof of his Charge and Contempt, no proof thereof.* 5. *His Oppoſition to our Teſtimony for Mens and Womens Meetings in the Church of Chriſt; and his ſcoffing and ſmiting thereat, no proof of his Charge, nor of their having* No Relation *to Scripture.* 6. *His upbraiding our ſober and faithful Womens Meeting as an* Idol, *and comparing it to the Papiſts great Idol; rebuked.* 7. *The ſame Challenge returned upon him, that we laid upon* W. Rogers, *being unanſwered by either.* 8. *His Rambling impertinently, not following the terms of the Challenge, which therefore is further urged againſt him.* 9. *His charge of Impoſition plainly proved falſe by the concluſive Recommendation of our Teſtimony inſtanced by him.* 10. *His groſly belying and abuſing* G. W. *and his Conſcience about* Condeſcention *and* Accommodation. 11. *His ſcornful Forgery on a Certificate from* Huntington *Meeting: His falſly repreſenting them therein, proved very wicked, on his own Conceſſion.* 12. *His ſcornful detraction againſt* R. Richardſon, *his Impertinency and ſillineſs in oppoſing* DEACONESSES, *as found out of ſome Popiſh Author,* &c. 13. *His ſcornfully writing and reflecting on* G. Whitehead; *and his inſolent Reviling, Boaſting, Abuſe and Slander, confuted by Certificate from divers Perſons of Credit,*

Credit. 14. *His trumpeting abroad the Fame of* Henry North, *Knight, &c. diſguſtful. A Propoſition and Advice to* Repentance *and* publick *and* plain Condemnation *of his Wicked and Scurrilous Book aforeſaid, with deſire of an Anſwer ſhortly, &c.* [But no ſuch Anſwer (nor any) as yet return'd, being now above ſix weeks ſince this Letter was left at *Ely* Priſon with *Samuel Cater*, to be conveyed to him] *With a Poſtſcript ſince added.*

The First Part.

Francis Bugg;

UPon the peruſal of thy two Letters lately ſent me, the one directed to *Samuel Cater* in *Ely* Goal, and the other to my ſelf, and *the reſt of the ſecond day Meeters* (as thy terms are.) And ſince thou art become ſuch an open contending Adverſary, I thought my ſelf the more concerned in Conſcience to take ſome notice, and give thee my ſence of thy proceeding and treatment in the Controverſies thou haſt ſo confidently undertaken, and become an officious Advocate in, that yet thou mayeſt be cautioned to ſtop thy pernicious Current, and deſtructive Race thou art running, and ſeriouſly bethink thy ſelf, and Repent, before thy final Deſtruction, which I clearly perceive thy extraordinary *Conceitedneſs*,

ceitedneſs, *Pride*, *Scorn* and *Envy*, &c. do tend to bring upon thee. By the way, I obſerve thy Allegations againſt *Samuel Cater*, about the *old Difference* between thee and him ſo long depending, touching the *FINE* laid upon thee for him, *as a Preacher*, for which thou confeſſeſt, *That thy Couſin* George Smith, *as his Wifes Agent*, *made thee Reſtitution*; and yet I perceive thou art uneaſie under *that Reſtitution* (as thou calleſt it) thou ſeemeſt concerned *that ſeveral Friends now bring up that old concern*, ſince thou publiſhed thy Book. But how did *George Smith* make thee Reſtitution? Did not he proffer thee half the Fine to ſtop thy Turbulency? but thou by Craft got beyond him for the whole, &c. wherein he and many more are greatly diſſatisfied; and which, if the Friends in thoſe parts give a circumſtantial Narrative of the whole tranſaction, and of thy Selfiſh Craft, Over-reaching and Fraudulency in that caſe, and be as free in their Publication, as thou haſt been againſt many faithful Servants of Chriſt, in thy confuſed ſcurrilous piece of *Impertinent Prate*, *Malice* and *Scorn*, I am perſwaded it will greatly redound to thy Diſ-repute and Infamy in the Eyes of all ſorts of intelligent Perſons, and lower thy Topſail to thy great abaſement, ſhame and confuſion of Face. Thou makeſt thy own terms for the

repayment

repayment of the whole 15 *l.* that *thy Couſin George Smith* (thou ſayeſt) *by* S Cater's *Wifes order, paid thee in Satisfaction for the Fine, thou ſuffered from him* (as thou pretendeſt) *And now I have the Money* (ſayeſt thou.) But I never yet underſtood that *Samuel Cater's* Wife did order him to pay the whole 15 *l.* neither would he have done it, but that thou madeſt him believe, *It was not for love of Money thou wouldſt have the whole tendred, &c. for thy Word's ſake.* Thou confeſſeſt he *firſt proffered thee* 5 l. *and when THAT would not do, he proffered thee* 7 l. 10 s.

Thus far it ſeems was his proffer to pacefie the buſineſs on *thy part:* The other part, to make it up 15 *l.* he did depoſit, in expectation thou wouldſt return it him, ſo he underſtood by thy ſmooth and crafty Pretenſions, *That THY END WAS NOT FOR MONEY*, &c. Thus he, *poor, well-meaning man* was inſnared, and *S. Cater* become the ſufferer. But upon what account got'ſt thou the whole 15 *l* from him, ſeeing the Penalty of the Conventicle Act doth not exceed 10 *l.* upon a Hearer, for the Poverty of the Preacher, or in default of his payment? And yet haſt thou the boldneſs to aſſert, *That if the Juſtice pleaſe, he may lay the* 20 l. *upon any ſingle Perſon preſent, of the Hearers.* But by what Law may he

do

do ſo; if the Penalty upon any one for anothers Offence amount not in the whole, to above the ſum of 10 *l.* as 'tis twice over limited in the Conventicle Act? For though the Juſtice be impowered to levy the 20 *l.* by Warrant, as aforeſaid (as the Words of the Act are) "*Upon the Goods* "*and Chattels of any ſuch* PERSONS, *who* "*ſhall be preſent at the ſame Conventicle, in* "*caſe the Preacher be a Stranger, and his* "*Name and Habitation not known, or is fled,* "*and cannot be found, or in the judgment of* "*the Juſtice, ſhall be thought unable to pay the* "*ſame.* Note, that 'tis upon any ſuch PERSONS, in the Plural, not upon any one Perſon the Fine is ſo to be levied; 'tis to be proportioned, ſo as that *no one Perſon ſhall be lyable to pay above* 10 l. *for any one Meeting, in regard of the Poverty of any other Perſon or Perſons,* as the expreſs Words of the Act are. See *what a miſtaken Lawyer thou art.* And was not the ſaid 15 *l.* an arbitrary puniſhment of thy own inflicting, both Illegal and Extrajudicial? What an arbitrary Perſecutor waſt thou therein? Mayeſt thou not be aſhamed to cry out againſt Impoſition, arbitrary Authority, and yet be ſuch an arbitrary Impoſer, and thy own Carver, to ſerve thy own fraudulent Enterprizes? IGNOBLE AND BASE! And now to excuſe thy arbitrary, extor-

ſive Fraud, to aſſert that which is *contra formam Statuti* in the caſe: Be aſhamed of ſuch Colluſion. I cannot but take notice of thy ſaying, *Thou toldſt him thou wouldſt have the whole tendred, which done, thou ſhouldſt make it appear that thy End was NOT ONLY for Money.* And how rarely haſt thou mended the matter now? Thou madeſt him believe 'twas not for love of Money; but now to mince and ſmooth it over, thy end was not *ONLY* for Money: It ſeems thy end was then in a great part for *Money*; but thou ſhouldſt have told him *plainly* aforehand how far thy end was for *Money*, and how far 'twas not for *Money*, that ſo he might not have been defrauded out of the whole 15 *l.* and thereby poor *Samuel Cater* his *Wife* and *Children* ſufferers in their Eſtate, meerly for quietneſs ſake, from thy complaints and clamours; if thy end was not *ONLY*, but *PARTLY* for Money, thou mightſt have been content with half of the 15 *l.* which *G. Smith* proffered thee; but it ſeems thy end was ſo *WHOLLY* for Money, that thou wouldſt have the *WHOLE* Fifteen Pound, according to thy own account: Thus Selfiſh, Arbitrary and Avaricious waſt thou. What a mean ſhift is it therefore for thee to ſay, *Thy end was not ONLY for Money?* We ſee what ſorry ſhifts and ſlighty Subterfuges a bad Cauſe muſt have.

And as a perſon conſcious to thy ſelf, diſquieted and uneaſie for a pretence, thou now makeſt this Propoſition (namely) S. Cater's *ſigning a Paper like this which follows, of thy own forming; and then thou wilt return the whole* 15 l. Thy Paper is this, *viz.*

† Memorandum, *That I* S. Cater *do hereby teſtifie, that is my judgment, That all Friends in the Miniſtry, where they are Strangers, ought to tell the Name and Habitation upon the apparent ſight of the Informers coming into a meeting, taking friends names in writing, or otherwiſe, in order to convict the Meeting, that ſo we may all ſtand in a like ſuffering capacity. Or if any have not freedom thus to do, that then they ought*

† *Francis Bugg*'s Propoſition implyes a Contradiction; for if *Samuel Cater* ſubſcribe the Inſtrument, he ought not to have his Money by the tenure of it, becauſe he told not his Name. If he do not ſubſcribe it as his judgment, then he alſo ought to have his Money again, according to F. B's tenet of *Chriſtian Liberty*, As *not ſeeing it his duty*; *ergo* he may not, or at leaſt ought not to be compelled to ſuffer for it.

Another contradiction is from the ground of his Law or Canon, *viz.* the equality in ſuffering For by his Rule a poor Miniſter muſt ſuffer 20 *l* when a rich Hearer, whom he miniſters

ought to make ſatisfaction to ſuch who ſuffer for them through their concealing their Names and Habitations; and that ſuch as refuſe to perform his or their part in either of theſe two Propoſitions, ought from thence forth to be reputed blame-worthy, and noted as ſuch. Witneſs my hand, the day above-written, per me.

miniſters to, but 5 s. And he on the apparent ſight of the Informer muſt tell his Name, when the other, but when he is asked it. Oh equal levelling Law! Are not the children of the world wiſer (looking on us as Levellers) to make the rich Hearers pay the poor Preachers penalties, as well as they look on them obliged to maintain them, on their own ſuppoſition.

[Thus far thy Preſcription.]

Further adding, viz. *I ſay, ſigne this Paper, or one like it, and I will return the ſaid* 15 l. *for the reaſon aforeſaid.* And this thou eſteem'ſt a *Condeſcention* ſufficient.

Thus art thou become a Dictator and Preſcriber and Impoſer upon others: Here thou haſt made a general Rule and Preſcription, as condition of thy returning the 15*l.* to *S. C.* [ſuch an improbable condition as thou couldſt not reaſonably ſuppoſe would be complied with. Thus inſincere thou appeareſt.] Here's a *Canon*, an *Edict* of thy framing, who haſt made a

great part of thy Book againſt *Canons, Preſcriptions, Rules, Edicts, Orders, Excommunications, &c.* How conſiſtent art thou in thy work? yea, and if the Miniſters will not obſerve this thy Canon to perform it, then to be reputed *Blame-worthy*, and noted as ſuch; and this thou wouldſt have *S. Cater* ſubſcribe. But thy *Canon* or *Preſcription* is illegal, lame and defective; yea, it exceeds the ſeverity and extent of the Conventicle Act, which no where compels all Friends in the Miniſtry, where thy are ſtrangers, to tell their Names and Habitations upon their apparent ſight of Informers coming into a Meeting and taking Friends Names in writing or otherwiſe; nor are any of the Meeters compelled by Law to tell their Names to Informers.

Thus Arbitrary, Illegal and Fooliſh too art thou in thy Canon and Conſtitution; thou wouldſt enforce upon Friends of the Miniſtry, where they are ſtrangers, who ſometimes may be ſilent in a Meeting, and ſometimes miniſtring when Informers come in to take Names, by thy Canon the Miniſters in ſilence muſt tell their Names and Habitations to Informers, and thoſe that are miniſtring muſt ſtop to tell the Informers their Names and Habitations. This illegal Impoſition of thine I further except againſt, in that it tends to gratifie the Informer's,

formers, and forward them in their designs and prosecution, for a more speedy and easie Conviction; * for if they get their Names thus readily told aforehand, as thy Canon and Prescription requires, they go presently to the Justices, swear the Offence, and cause the Conviction in the absence of the party concerned. In consideration of which, divers of us, even of late time, in the Meetings at *Westminster* have not had freedom presently to tell our Names to Informers and Officers, to leave them to inform the Justices what they please upon Oath, without controul, in our absence, but rather we have chosen to go to the Justices, that there we may tell our Names to them, and have opportunity to object to their faces against any Mis-informations. Thus thou hast failed and shewed thy shortness and shallowness in thy imperious and illegal *Prescription* and *Imposition*.

* *Marg. added*, Yet I do not limit Persons in this case; there may be a special occasion to tell Names for the sake of others, but not to make that a general Rule — Friends are to be left free to Gods counsel.

As for thy pressing for *the Preachers who are Strangers to tell their Names*, as aforesaid, and so to be in an *Equal capacity with the Hearers in suffering*.

1st, We cannot make a Law to enjoyn them

to tell their Names to Informers, which the Law requires not: I know none that refuſe to tell their Names to the civil Magiſtrate. We know the Preachers generally are moſt ſtruck at, and moſt liable to ſuffer, and the Penalties are moſt ſevere upon them, as 20 *l.* for a firſt, and 40 *l.* for a ſecond Offence (ſo called) and if Strangers, they are *not wholly free from Sufferings* (as thou ſayeſt.) But all Preachers more lyable in the firſt place to ſuffer Impriſonment, &c. than others, being moſt envyed and aimed at by the *Perſecutors*.

2*dly*, We cannot in point of Chriſtianity, Truth or good Conſcience, deem the Preacher *an Offender*, if we own his Miniſtry, *So* as to lay an Obligation upon him not only to tell his Name to *Informers*, but to be the greateſt Sufferer. Truth's intereſt and cauſe is but one in Miniſter and Hearer, and Chriſtian love leads us therein to ſympathize and ſuffer one with another in Spirit; yea, and outwardly too, if there be neceſſity, and not to make preaching the Goſpel an offence, any more than meeting or hearing it Preacht, ſeeing the Labour, and Pains, and greateſt Hazard commonly is the Preachers, the advantage thereof is the Hearers. And if we have true Unity with the Goſpel Preachers, we ſhall not complain againſt them, becauſe of the Fines,

Fines, nor think our ſelves to be bound under thy Preſcription or Canon, who art both in *Diſ-union* with them, and *Enmity* againſt them, much leſs to follow thy Crafty method, to pay our ſelves out of their Eſtates, when fined for them, or for their not telling their Names to Informers on ſight, &c.

3*dly*, If thou makeſt the Preachers ſuch Offendors, as that for want of telling their Names to Informers, they muſt be Reſponſible to the full, or wholly for the Fines laid upon Hearers on their account, and thereupon thy Eye is ſo ſevere upon them, as if they were the *greateſt Offendors*. This is but the ſame Spirit that's in the Perſecutors and Informers, that's not in unity with, but in Enmity againſt the Goſpel-Miniſters. This would not lay down its Life for the Brethren, that will not ſuffer 5 *l.* or 10 *l.* for them: And then I preſume there's no danger of thy ſuffering much on that account, who couldſt ſo craftily repay thy ſelf the whole 15 *l.* from *Samuel Cater*.

In this very Action, and thy malicious Book, thou appeareſt a Perſon more ready to turn Informer againſt the true Miniſters and Servants of Chriſt, than to loſe 10 *l.* on any of their account, by thy offenſive Characters and *Popiſh* Compariſons thou haſt put upon them, particularly upon *George*

Fox, *William Penn*, *George Whitehead*, *Stephen Criſp*, *Alexander Parker*, *Thomas Salthouſe* and *John Burnyeat*, whom thou haſt repreſented in Print as Apoſtates, Antichriſtian, Innovators, Impoſers, Popiſh, &c. for their Chriſtian advice in divers particulars, cited by thee in thy printed Book, *De Chriſtiana Libertate*, with thy ſcandalous defaming Obſervations upon them ſeverally, from page 32. to page 57. to prove thy Unjuſt charge *of doing Violence to our firſt Principles of Union*, which they and we all utterly deny.

4*thly*, And the more like an Informer haſt thou appeared, in ambitiouſly dedicating thy Book to a Great Man, i. e. *Henry North*, Knight, and in ſhewing that thou deſigned it for the Magiſtrates, in pretending to have laid before them *a clear Demonſtration for Liberty of Conſcience*; thy Book being in two Parts, as is confeſt in the Title, and both Bound up and made to go in one: So that if the Magiſtrates ſee the firſt Part for Liberty of Conſcience, (which is not thy own) they are liable to ſee thy ſecond Part, wherein (as an Enemy to Chriſtian-Liberty) thou art bitterly inveighing and clamouring againſt many faithful Servants and Miniſters of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt (who are well approved among the People called *Quakers*) for their ſignifying

ſignifying and giving their Chriſtian Advice and Sence, in things needful to be practiſed in the Church, whereby thou art oppoſing the Liberty of their Conſciences, which they have in Chriſt Jeſus; and art endeavouring to expoſe them as obnoxious and offenſive to the Magiſtrate and outward Government, rendering them *Tyrannical* and *Popiſh*, like *the Pope's Councils*, &c. Thus falſe Informer-like, thou haſt broke all Bonds of Chriſtian Friendſhip, Society and Church-Order, and haſt acted the part of a treacherous, perſecuting Informer, in the very nature, purport and ſeries of thy Book.

And I doubt not, but thy Infamous work will become odious to all Serious, Religious and Impartial Diſſenting *Proteſtants*, the more it comes to Light, and to be ſtrictly ſcand, and that thou wilt appear thereby not only as a turbulent, but perfidious, treacherous Perſon, and malicious Informer againſt thy own Society, and therefore not to be truſted by any other Societies or People, on any Religious and ſociable account.

Thou haſt alſo in thy Letter ſcurrilouſly abuſed and miſrepreſented *S. Cater*, *J. Parks*, and my ſelf, and alſo the Womens Meeting, as *That* Samuel Cater *had* 10 *l. preſently ſent him out of the Treaſury from London:*

London: And that *The Women's Meeting gathered ſo much Money for* James Parks, *upon his pretence of being Robbed.* Both which I have made enquiry into, and find them falſe in Fact; *Samuel Cater* belyed, the Women's Meeting belyed, and *James Parks* belyed, in the ſtate of theſe Accuſations. Be aſhamed therefore of ſuch Abuſes, or produce Proof both of Fact and Circumſtance, as ſtated by thee. Be aſhamed alſo of thy ſaying, *James Parks acted the part of an* Oliverian *Preacher, or* G. W. *once at* Snare-Hill, *or like ſome SUCH PENSIONERS.*

Didſt thou ever tell me of any thing thou hadſt againſt me at *Snare-Hill*? I am not Conſcious to my ſelf, but am ſure thou doſt ſhamefully belye me and *J. P.* in calling us *Penſioners.* What Penſion, Wages, or yearly Stipend doſt thou charge me or us withal? What an unconſcionable Defamer art thou? Doſt thou know what *Penſioner* means? This is ſomewhat like thy eſpouſing and printing the Report of *Nicholas Lucas*'s ſaying, *That I went up and down to Cheat the Country.* And thy affirming, *That truly my Behaviour hath manifeſted the truth thereof*, page 150. of thy Book.

Thus in thy Letter before, ſent after me in Manuſcript, without the leaſt occaſion given thee by me, that I know of; ſince which

which to amend the matter of thy Scandalous defaming abuſe of me, before cited, thou addeſt this Parentheſis, viz. [*I reckon he meant not of Money, but the People of their Liberty they have right to*] Which is alſo a Slander and baſe come-off, and thouſands of God's People are able to teſtifie againſt theſe thy defaming and inſolent Lyes. I never was accounted a *Cheat* and *Penſioner* before. As alſo in thy calling *Thomas Rudyard* LYING LAWYER, for ſaying, *Thou paidſt thy Money Voluntarily before Diſtreſs was made on thy Goods:* This I ſhewed *Thomas Rudyard*, and he counts it a foul abuſe, ſlander and defamation upon his Perſon and Employment, to call him *Lying Lawyer*, ſuppoſing thou placeſt his Lying upon the word *Volunt arily*. If thou didſt pay or depoſit thy Fine on thy Appeal, and ſo prevented Diſtreſs (as he underſtood thou then didſt at that time) he accounted it *Voluntary*, in reſpect of the Law, becauſe the Act of Parliament in that caſe doth not compel thee to pay thy Fine upon entring thy Appeal; for that the Appeal may be entred within one weeks time *after the Fine is paid*, OR *Diſtreſs made*; ſo that 'tis in the Appealants choice whether to pay the Fine or ſuffer Diſtreſs firſt; for the Particle *OR* is disjunctive between both. Where is now the *LYING LAWYER?*

Art

Art not thou herein manifeſt to be the *LYING DEFAMER*, that haſt ſo little regard to the Reputation or Credit of others? Where's thy Conſcience, or doing as thou wouldſt be done by?

Thy Envy and Defamation ſtops not here, but thou haſt falſly accuſed us (of the Second days Meeting) with *loving to have the Pre-eminence:* He that ſearches and knows our Hearts, ſees and will judge thy falſe Judgment and Abuſe in this and many other things; as alſo in thy falſe and abuſive Inſinuation in telling of the *Sums, Gratuities and large Penſions, privately extended to ſuch* (ſpeaking of *James Parks*) *and others of his Fraternity: And which far exceed THAT of the Baſon and Platter, we uſually, and with too much confidence* (ſayſt thou) *beſpatter the Profeſſors withal, ſeeing we do the ſame thing for which we condemn them only a little privater.* [Thus far thy falſe and abuſive Accuſation againſt ſuch as *James Parks* and his Brethren.]

Oh horrid Impudence and Falſhood! be aſhamed hereof: Thou heapeſt up Slanders and Defamations againſt the Innocent, for which God will rebuke thee. 'Tis not unknown how many of us ſpend our Strength, Labour and Subſtance in the ſervice of the Lord and his People in many reſpects, wherein I for one have not had the leaſt

leaſt ſhare, though now by thee rendred a *Cheat* and a *Penſioner*. Oh! bluſh and be aſhamed of ſuch abominable Lyes and ſcurrilous Detractions.

To conclude thy Letter, on thy falſhood againſt the Womens Meeting *gathering Money, &c.* thou ſcornfully inferreſt, that therein they have forfeited their Charter, mentioned in thy Book, p. 37. and deſerves a COERANTO to be brought, *&c.* I cannot but take notice what a liberty thou takeſt to ſcoff, mock and jeer againſt our Religious Chriſtian Womens Meeting, and how abuſive and ſilly thou art therein, although thou haſt often ſcornfully twitted me with the words *LEARNED FRIEND*, in thy Book and Letters, as if it were ſuch a great Crime to aſcribe that to any Friend, whilſt yet thou art ambitious to ſhew thy ſelf a learned Perſon. Here to ſhew thy Learning in the Latin Tongue, thou telleſt us of a *COERANTO*, which is no good *Latine* to be ſure, and thou mayſt be queſtioned in what Language thou hadſt the Expreſſion. * I ſuppoſe thou haſt lately heard Diſcourſes of *Quo Warranto* about the City-Charter, upon which from thy own imaginary conceit thou writeſt us *COERANTO* in a large *Italick* Character, that it may appear how learned and skilled thou

* *Q. added*, If it be not Dog-Latin?

thou art in *Latine* and *Law*; and likewiſe we muſt have a *Latine* Title to thy Book, ſecond Part, i. e. *De Chriſtianâ Libertate*: But where thou learnedſt this Title, and what ſtreſs or Emphaſis canſt thou place upon its being in *Latine* more than if it had been in *Engliſh*, i. e. *Concerning Chriſtian-Liberty?* For *Liberty of Conſcience aſſerted*, is not the *Engliſh* of thy *Latine* Title, but varies from it in the Terms, as well as in the Nature of it: And thy proſecution for *Liberty of Conſcience*, as aſſerted by thee, appears a Liberty not only in oppoſition to Perſecution, but alſo to our *Godly Care*, *Advice*, *Counſel* and *Admonition*, relating to good Order and Church-Government amongſt us, and teſtified unto in our Paper oppoſed by thee in thy Book (from page 41, to page 51.) And if this muſt be the extent of thy Chriſtian-Liberty, thou mightſt better have entituled thy Book, *Pro Libertate Carnali*; for it ſeems the Liberty pleaded for by thee, admits not of Spiritual Cenſures, Reproofs, Advice or Judgment, according to Chriſt's Law exhibited, as appears by thy ſcurrilous oppoſition & infamous Characters thou giveſt to our ſaid Paper, partly cited in thy Book, and moſt Unchriſtianly and Unjuſtly made thy great Proof of our *Doing Violence to our firſt Principles of Union*, *and conſequently turned*

turned Antichriſtian; and ſuch thou renderest *William Penn*, *George Whitehead*, *Alexander Parker*, *Stephen Criſp*, *Thomas Salthouſe*, *John Burnyeat*, whoſe Names thou haſt expoſed in Print, as the Perſons unjuſtly charged by thee. But we have not yet concluded thy Learning in *Cheranto*, but muſt view a little more of it in thy Book, on the paſſage thou haſt borrowed on truſt from *William Rogers* his Tranſlation, as he confeſſeth, for which we have only his own Authority in theſe Words, (viz.) *Which for the ſake of ſome, I thus Tranſlate*, (7th Part, *Chriſtian Quaker*, p. 62.) 'Tis in thy 125, 126, 127, 128 pages, out of Biſhop *Hooper*; the firſt Words, *Scitis quod res ſancta, et vera quo magis examinatur.* Thou accepts his Tranſlation hereof in theſe words, *KNOW YE, that by how much the more*, &c. Here *Scitis*, the very firſt Word, which is, *Ye know*, in the *Indicative*, is falſly tranſlated *know ye*, as *Scite* in the *Imperative*; whereas by *Scitis* in this place was intended *Indication*, *Demonſtration*, or *Proof*, and not imperatively *Teaching*; and likewiſe *Nam quod variis modis tentatur; ac probatur, modo pium ac ſanctum FUERIT, Jacturam ab hoſtibus nullam ſentit*, is thus tranſlated (viz.) *For that which is tryed and proved after various manners, if IT HATH BEEN*, &c. inſtead of *IT SHALL BE*; for

for *FUERIT* is exact future (as they term it.) Many things of the Types and Shadows under the Law, as *Tythes* and *Offerings*, &c. *have been holy*, but ſhall not be again, *afficitis* is made *afflict* inſtead of *affect*, and alſo *Legem & Evangelium Dei*, are tranſlated *The Word of God*, inſtead of *The Law and Goſpel of God*; then at laſt *Judicio*, is, *to the Judgment*, when it ſhould be more properly *by the Judgment*: But the moſt material Miſtake is in the very firſt word *Scitis*, falſly tranſlated, as to the Mood.

But theſe Inſtances are only to ſhew thee what a ridiculous Novice and Ludibrie thou haſt rendred thy ſelf, both in Writing and Print, even to School-Boys: I ſaw lately a School-Boy of Eleaven Years old Laugh at thy Abſurdity, as a Perſon wiſe in thy own Conceit. Yet whilſt thou wouldſt make a ſhow and flouriſh of Learning, thou haſt here taken a falſe Tranſlation upon an implicit Faith and blind Credulity: Thou that art ſuch a fierce oppoſer of implicit Faith and blind Obedience, and haſt ſo often ſcoft at me for the Words, *Learned Friend*, in reference to *R. R.* I wonder thou art not aſhamed of ſuch ſcornful treatment, and medling ſo often with *Latine*, when I find thou canſt not write true *Engliſh* in many things.

This

This is only a ſmall Check to thy Pride and empty Conceits, this not being one of the abſurdeſt Faults or Falſhoods thou haſt preſented the World withal. Come down and be humbled before the All-ſeeing God.

From thy antient Friend, and yet Well-wiſher, though inſolently abuſed by thee,

G. Whitehead.

Middleſex, the 22d day of the 7th Moneth, 1682.

The Second Part of the ſaid Letter.

Francis Bugg;

NOw concerning thy Book, ſtiled, *DE CHRISTIANA LIBERTATE*, or *Liberty of Conſcience*, &c. 1*ſt*, I obſerve thou begineſt unjuſtly to accuſe and reflect upon the People called *Quakers* in the very Title page, in theſe Words, viz. *And the miſchief of Impoſitions amongſt the People called Quakers*, &c. *In two Parts.* And that thou concerneſt the Magiſtracy with it, both in thy Epiſtle dedicated to *H. North*, Knight, (as being obliged to publiſh it for the *Information of the Magiſtracy*, &c.) as alſo in thy Epiſtle, directed

to the *Noble Bereans*, thou concerneſt the Magiſtrates, as having in the Book prefixed (i. e. thy *firſt Part*) laid before them many weighty Arguments for *Liberty of Conſcience*, &c. So that to the Magiſtrates thou haſt given thy Information againſt the People called *Quakers*, as having *miſchievous Impoſitions* among them; which we utterly deny; and thy Scornful Malicious Book proves it not. Thus thou art turned *Informer* to the Magiſtrates againſt an Innocent ſuffering People, whom thou haſt ſo long walked amongſt: How dareſt thou appear in their Meetings, and thus act the part of a *treacherous*, *malicious Informer* againſt them, even to the Magiſtrates? Oh! Bluſh and be aſhamed of this thy hateful Work.

2dly, Thou having entituled thy ſelf to to the matters contain'd in a Treatiſe, entituled, *Liberty of Conſcience aſſerted and vindicated*, by thy high Commendations given of it to *H. North*, as *Being perſwaded it will be of Good Service*; and (in thy Epiſtle to the *Bereans*) *A clear Demonſtration*, &c. And in thy *Preface* to the Reader, of the Author, thou thus ſayeſt, viz. *His Judgment upon this Subject, is my Judgment.*

Now obſerve what this Author's Judgment is concerning the Light in men, whereupon he chiefly placeth his Demonſtration

ſtration for *Liberty of Conſcience.* In page 4. he ſaith, viz. *Their Natural Light, derived to them from their firſt Creation, dictating to them what they ought to do, and what not, and enabling them to paſs a Judgment upon themſelves of their due behaviour towards God,* &c. With ſome other paſſages of like nature in the ſaid Treatiſe.

Here (*Francis*) thou haſt preſented *H. North,* and the Magiſtrates with unſound and unſcriptural Doctrine, and appeareſt *Apoſtate,* and corrupt in thy Judgment, in calling the *Light* in men (which thus dictates their duty) *Their natural Light, derived to them from their firſt Creation*: Herein thou haſt wrongfully informed *H. N.* and the Magiſtrates about the *Principle, the Light* in men, contrary to the *Quakers* Teſtimony, born from the beginning concerning the Light in men, which is according to the holy Apoſtle's Teſtimony, *John* 1. 4, 9. that *In the Word, or Son of God, was Life; and that Life was the Light of men*; And that this is not a *natural* or *created Light,* but a *Supernatural* and *Divine Light* of the Chriſt Jeſus, the Son of God.

3*dly,* And now (*Francis*) having thus miſrepreſented our Principle to the Magiſtrates, and ſo miſ-informed them about the Light in men. Thou proceedeſt upon an unjuſt charge of *Impoſitions* againſt cer-

tain Perſons, chiefly concerned, owned and approved among the People called *Quakers*, whom thou ſcornfully calleſt *G. Fox, and thoſe of Party with him*; and haſt expoſed the Names of ſome of them in Print, whom thou meaneſt by *that Party*, as *William Penn, George Whitehead, Stephen Criſp, Alexander Parker, Thomas Salthouſe, John Burnyeat*, p. 51. And what haſt thou to charge all theſe with, that thou haſt printed a Book and informed the Magiſtracy againſt them? It is *The miſchief of Impoſitions*; *The inconſiſtency betwixt the Church-Diſcipline, or Order and Government erected by thoſe*, and *THAT in the Primitive times* (as in the Title of thy ſecond part.) It is alſo, *That there is Violence done to our firſt Principles of Union*; Conſequently *Tyranny introduced, and our Society turned Antichriſtian*, p. 32, 33. (According to *W. P.*'s Propoſition in his *Addreſs*, thus falſly applyed by thee againſt himſelf, and the reſt of us before-named.) Now *Francis*, I muſt plainly tell thee, this *Inconſiſtency and Violence* charged by thee againſt us, we utterly deny, and the Inſtances thou giveſt do not at all prove it, "As firſt, *G. F.'s* Paper for Women's Meeting "diſtinct, that they might be in the practice "of pure Religion, to viſit the Fatherleſs "and the Widows, and to ſee that all be "kept

Thy Charge collected.

"kept from the ſpots of the World, &c. [As 'tis cited at large by thee, *p.* 33, 34, 35, 36, 37.]

Now (*Francis*) where's the Inconſiſtency charged? Can there be an Inconſiſtency where there's no Contradiction, nor the leaſt oppoſition? Thy judging ſuch Women's Meetings as are for the Practice or Promotion of pure Religion, in the practical parts of it, inconſiſtent with the Chriſtian-Diſcipline, Order and Government in the Primitive times, doth beſpeak not only that thou doſt not well underſtand what *Inconſiſtent* means, but alſo that thou haſt undertaken a Charge thou art never able to make good. And thy charge of *Violence* done to our firſt Principles of Union is worſe than *Inconſiſtent*. And thy ſcornfully telling of the *Women's Charter and New Order*, is no Proof (man) of thy Charge: Where's the *Inconſiſtency* and *Violence* that's charged, done by the faithful Womens Meetings among us, or by any of us, by encouraging them to meet for thoſe Religious and Charitable ends and ſervices mentioned? How haſt thou acted the part of an ignorant conceited Scoffer, inſtead of proving thy Charge before cited? Beſides, the very ſelf-ſame Paper writ by *G. F.* which thou haſt cited as an inſtance of our Inconſiſtency and Violence, was

received, owned and approved at a Quarterly Meeting at *Kendal* in *Weſtmorland*, in the Year 1671. And another written in approbation thereof, and ſubſcribed by ſome of thy own party, as *John Wilkinſon*, *Richard Stephanſon*, *Henry Garnet*, and Twenty one more Friends, for encouraging of the Women's aſſembling, and Religious Charitable Services before propoſed, both which are cited at large in our Book, Entituled, *The Accuſer of our Brethren*, from pag. 98, to p. 102. Thus contradictory art thou to ſome of thy own Brethren, in thy condemning the ſame Paper as an Impoſition, Inconſiſtency and Violence to our firſt Principles, which they ſo plainly approved of.

4*thly*, Again, in purſuance of thy unrighteous Charge before cited, thou reciteſt four paſſages out of a Paper of ours, dated, *London*, the 27th of the 3d Moneth, 1675. which was given as our Judgment and Advice in certain things needful, for good Order among us (as we believed) The firſt Paſſage thou haſt cited, is that for Marriages to be at leaſt twice propounded to the Meetings, that are to take care therein, &c. before they are accompliſhed, &c. Now where's the Inconſiſtency here, with the Diſcipline in the Primitive Chriſtian Church, or the Violence done to our

firſt

firſt Principles of Union? Inſtead of proving thy charge by this inſtance, we have in thy Obſervation a piece of Scorn and Mockery, viz. *This notable, if not univerſal Council: Their new ſtamped Government*, p. 42. Oh! be aſhamed of ſuch Scorn and Folly! Is this thy proof of thy charge? Is it a violation to our firſt Principles of Union, to have Marriages propoſed at leaſt twice to the Meetings concerned? (both Mens and Womens, where both are eſtabliſhed) However, to be twice propoſed to ſuch Meetings as are eſtabliſhed, and to take care therein, to underſtand that the Perſons be clear, and Friends ſatisfied, before the Marriage be accompliſhed? And this has been theſe many Years practiſed among us; and I know no true Union broken thereby, nor any violation done to our firſt Principles thereof: Be aſhamed therefore of thy fruitleſs attempts, in giving ſuch an high charge againſt us, when thou canſt make no proof it.

5*thly*, Concerning our Teſtimony on behalf of Mens and Womens Meetings in the Church of Chriſt; as for their Riſe and Eſtabliſhment, being in the counſel of God, and for the encouraging Faithful and Grave Women therein, and to admoniſh them that diſcountenance or weaken their Hands in the Work and Service of the Lord, &c.

Thou calleſt this *A Decree, a decretal Order*; *This New faſhioned Edict*, p. 45, 46. And ſayſt, *It has no relation to Scripture-Authority, Precept or Preſident; no relation to the Example of the Holy men of God recorded in Scripture, nor any command of God or Jeſus Chriſt.* Why no Relation to them? How proveſt thou that? what becauſe we have not every particular circumſtance of Perſons and things expreſt? Whence it follows not that this has no relation to Scripture or Preſident, &c. Holy Women and Siſters in the Faith, Elder Widdows that were honourable, and Deaconeſſes, did many Religious and Charitable Services in the Primitive Chriſtian Churches: What then might they not meet and confer together for one anothers help and encouragement in thoſe Services they had, and were frequently imployed in? Can it either be a violence to their Principles of Union for ſuch to meet together? or have their Aſſemblies no relation to Scripture? What contrariety thereto have they? Surely we alwayes accounted our Religious Meetings, to ſerve one another in Love, conſiſtent with our Union and the Principles thereof. And ſo for Godly Women to meet for thoſe Religious and Charitable ends and Services, for which their Aſſemblies are intended, muſt needs be conſiſtent with the ſame Principles of Love and Union,

Union, and tend to the Increaſe thereof, and not to the Violation thereof, as thou haſt falſly charged. Upon our Admonition, "Not to diſcountenance or weaken their "Hands in the Work and Service of the "Lord. Thou maketh this obſervation, viz. *See what a ſtrict and ſevere admonition is uttered forth, even as if it had come from the Pope's Council of Jeſuits and crafty Fryars,* [Scoffing and Smiting ſtill at the Womens Meetings] p. 46, 47.

How now (*Francis*) is this thy treatment and compariſon of us? Hadſt thou no better than the Pope's Council of Jeſuits and crafty Fryars to compare us unto, in our Teſtimony and Admonition? Oh! be aſhamed of ſuch foul, ſordid, and ſcornful, and falſe treatment, who inſtead of proving thy Charge of *Inconſiſtence* and *Violence*, as before, now abuſeth us, mocks and ſcoffs, and ſcandallizeth us, like a conceited proud Fool.

6thly, Be aſhamed alſo of thy ſcornfully upbraiding us with *our Womens Meetings, as an Idol of our own erecting*; and asking, *Why ſhould it not publickly be brought to Light, and made as manifeſt as the* Lord Cromwell *made the* Papiſts *great Idol, to wit, the Rood of Grace (which had goggling Eyes, and would ſmile when a good Gift was offorded to it) when he cauſed it to be brought to* Paul's *Croſs, where*

the

the People tore it all to pieces, in King Henry *the 8ht's time*, p. 47.

Oh, thou ungodly Wretch and malicious Informer! is this a fit Compariſon and Inſtance to preſent the Magiſtrates with, againſt our Chriſtian, Religious, Charitable and Sober *Womens Meetings?* And doſt thou under ſuch an abominable and odious Compariſon thus expoſe them to the Magiſtrates, for their Meetings, to be torn to pieces? Thou vile Wretch, bluſh and be aſhamed of ſuch malicious, ſcornful and defaming Impertinences, thus inſtead of proving thy before-cited Charge, to act the malicious, reviling and falſe accuſing Informer againſt God's People; then ſcornfully concludeſt thy Obſervation with theſe words, viz. *This notable, not Scriptural, but Anti-ſcriptural Edict*, p. 48. Which is a falſe Concluſion, without Premiſes, and a ſhameful begging the Queſtion, wherein thou art an Impoſer; for not one ſentence or word in all that ſaid Paper of our ſence and Advice haſt thou proved *ANTI-SCRIPTURAL*, or *directly contrary to Scripture*, as thy terms are, p. 79. Thou ſhouldſt then have ſhewn us what Scripture forbids either faithful Womens Aſſembling, or thoſe Religious and Charitable ends and ſervices propoſed, which their Meetings are intended

intended for? I dare challenge thee in this to prove thy charge of Anti-ſcriptural.

7thly, I do affirm, thou art ſo far from making good thy Charge, that for all thy Attempts, I have ſtill occaſion to return the ſame charge upon thee that we did upon *William Rogers*, which for a pretence thou citeſt, but doſt not anſwer it, p. 39. *viz.*

„ What new and unchriſtian Doctrines „ and Practices are we fallen into? We find „ no proof nor diſcovery thereof in all thy „ Book. I do profeſs ſeriouſly (however thou ſcoffingly calleſt me *a notable ſerious George*) „ I ſee no cauſe nor reaſon thou ſheweſt for „ the great *noiſe* & *rumble* thou makeſt about „ *outward Laws, Preſcriptions, Orders, Edicts* „ or *Decrees, outward form of Government,* „ *Apoſtacy, Innovation, Impoſitions, Lording* „ *over Faith, over Conſcience,* &c. (To which I „ may add thy terms, *Womens Charter, Grant,* „ *Confirmation, New Order, Decretal Order,* „ *New faſhion'd Edict, Popes Council, Papiſts* „ *great Idol, Canonical Rules, New ſpiritual* „ *Lords, Decrees, Canons, Edicts of Men,* „ *Tyrannical proceedings*, &c.) whilſt thou „ ſheweſt to us no unjuſt, no unlawful nor „ uncomely Order or Proceedings amongſt „ us, as a People, nor yet giveſt us any „ Catalogue or Inſtance of thoſe *Impoſitions,* „ *Innovations, New Doctrines* or *Practices* „ brought in and received amongſt us, which

„ are

„ are *INCONSISTENT* with our first Te-
„ ſtimony to the Light and Grace of God
„ within, and teaching thereof, or thereby
„ condemned as Evil, or wholly unneceſſary
„ in themſelves (as our words are.)

Sthly, This thou doſt not anſwer, but *Marvelleſt that* G. Whitehead *ſhould have the Confidence thus to call for a Catalogue of* New Orders *that are introduced among us; or rather* (ſayſt thou) *Impudence to deny ſuch things as are every Moneth put in practice among us. And therefore* ſayſt, *thou wilt bring forth Proof and Preſident; firſt the Confirmation of the Foundation of the Womens Meetings, namely,* G. F's *Order by a general Council held at London*, 1675.

To all which I muſt tell thee, thou doſt not follow the terms of the Challenge, but rambleſt impertinently, telling us of *New Orders, ſuch things, the Confirmation of the Foundation of the Womens Meetings*, &c. but proveſt not thoſe things (nor one thing) practiſed among us as a People; or that *firſt Confirmation*, as thou falſly calleſt it, to be *Inconſiſtent* with (or contrary to) our firſt Teſtimony to the Light and Grace of God within, and teachings thereof. 'Tis not thy making a noiſe with *New Orders, Decrees*, &c. ſhall ſerve thy turn in this point; but I challenge thee to prove that the ſetting up and encouraging our faithful

Womens

Womens Meetings are contrary to the Light and Grace of God within and teachings thereof. This is matter thou haſt undertaken to bring proof and preſident for. This is cloſe to the terms of our Challenge, and thou haſt but made ſhuffling, ſlubbering work about it.

9*thly*, Moreover, what we propounded in our Paper aforeſaid, (which thou calleſt *The Confirmation by a general Council held at* London, Anno 1675. and which thou haſt inſtanced for proof of thy Charge of *Inconſiſtency* and *Violence*, and conſequently as *Antichriſtian*) was tenderly concluded in theſe terms, viz. "*All which we recommend* "*to the Evidence of Gods holy* "*Witneſs in the Hearts of his* "*People.* * Why didſt thou not take notice of this Concluſion, to have prevented thy falſe charge of *Impoſition*, wherein thou haſt contradicted thy Brother *William Rogers*; for he hath divers times aſſented to and own'd the giving advice and counſel by way of Recommendation, diſtinguiſhing that from Impoſition, as his own Books and Words are evidence. But thou cryſt out, *Impoſitions*,

Query added.
* I do ſeriouſly ask *William Rogers*, if this Paper of ours, thus Recommended, be ſufficient *proof* of Impoſition, and being turned Antichriſtian? I deſire plain Anſwer hereunto, in relation to what he has granted for a *Recommendation*, &c.

Inconſiſtency,

Inconſiſteney, Violence to our firſt Principles of Union, on that very ſame Paper which is concluded by way of Recommendation to the Evidence of Gods holy Witneſs in the Hearts of his People. And to this and other Papers of Advice, Judgment, *&c.* thou haſt oppoſed *Liberty of Conſcience*, and ſo made void Spiritual Cenſures, contrary to the very Author thou haſt printed, owned and eſpouſed, as being *of the ſame Judgment with thee*, where he ſaith, pag. 138. part 1. „ *'Tis very fit, that whereſoever you will ſup-* „ *poſe Errors to be ſprung up, all the means* „ *Chriſt hath appointed for that end ſhould be* „ *uſed to ſuppreſs them, and reclaim Men* „ *from them: Let their Mouthes be ſtop-* „ *ped with ſound Doctrine and* Spiritual „ Cenſures. *The only Queſtion is about the* „ *uſe of the Temporal Power in ſuch things.*—— „ *Principles and Opinions in the Mind were* „ *never extinguiſhed by the puniſhing the Body.* Here his Liberty of Conſcience pleaded, is not from ſpiritual Cenſures, as thou haſt perverted it, but from corporal Puniſhments.

10*thly*, Whereas in our Book, *Acenſer, &c.* pag. 127. we ſignified, that having theſe things in our Eye, *viz.* „ The great „ ends of true Religion and Chriſtian „ Society, a godly Care over one another, „ provoking one another to Love and good „ Works, we can the more eaſily concur

„ and

„and accord, as to Circumſtances and out-
„ward Methods; and in the Wiſdom of
„ God ſo to *condeſcend* one to another, and
„ *accommodate* matters, as not to divide
„ about them, *&c.*

Againſt this thou excepteſt, in theſe words, *viz.* p. 96. *I marvel that the Author of the* Accuſer, &c. *which is ſaid to be* G. Whitehead, *ſhould have the Confidence thus to appear in Print, when his own Conſcience tells him the contrary, inſtancing* R. Smith *of* Colne, *as not admitted to have his Wife, becauſe he would not go into the Womens Meeting: The grand Oppoſer was* G. W.——*It may evidently appear how far* G. W. *was from* Accommodation *or* Condeſcention, *which he fallaciouſly pretends to the World, in order to deceive them, to cover their Deceit, Hypocriſie and Arbitrary Church-Government, Dominion and Lordſhip, &c.* p. 97.

And to aggravate the matter againſt *G. W.* in page 129. thou ſayſt, *That the pretence of the Author of the* Accuſer, *to* Condeſcention *and* Accommodation *is fallacious and falſe, and a meer piece of feigned Hypocriſie to amuſe the Reader and delude the World.* And likewiſe in pag. 150. thou art ſmiting at *G. W.* on the ſame account.

Here thou haſt brought my name upon the Stage in Print, but haſt moſt groſly belyed me and abuſed me, as to my Conſcience,

ſcience, in ſaying *it tells me the contrary.* Be aſhamed of this thy preſumptious beſpattering and abuſing me in Print; for my Conſcience tells me, I was real in what I propoſed in *Condeſcention* and *Accommodating* matters, and that I was no deceiver therein, as thou proudly ſlandereſt me. The *Condeſcention* and *Accommodation* was to thoſe that had the great ends of true Religion, Chriſtian care and love one to another in their Eye; it was to the upright and tender hearted, and not to the exalted, hard and wilful. And I gave my Chriſtian and tender Advice to the Perſon who then propoſed his Intention, in order to convince him of the reaſonableneſs of what I propoſed, and he ſhewed no reaſon againſt it, but remained ſtiff and pertinacious, which I cannot impute to a real tender Conſcience; the woman was tender and flexible, and of a better Spirit. Therefore be aſhamed of abuſing and belying me in Print, as for *appearing in Print contrary to my Conſcience,* as thou haſt ſhamefully belyed me, and ſo falſly informed the Magiſtrates againſt me, as about *Condeſcention* and *Accommodation* (and divers other things) about which I muſt farther tell thee, The condeſcention of primitive Chriſtians was to them of low degree, the ſtrong in bearing with the weak, bearing one anothers burthens, and ſo fulfil-

ling

ling the Law of Chriſt. The Perſons unto whom the *Condeſcention* was, were in a meaſure of the ſame *faith* and *love*; it was not to falſe Brethren (ſuch as thou art) or to falſe Apoſtles, deceitful Workers, who cauſed Diviſions, *&c.* falſe Brethren that watched with an evil Eye, to ſuch the true Apoſtle gave not place by ſubjection, no, not for an hour: What Apoſtolical condeſcention was then given to them? There was an Apoſtolical authority and ſharpneſs, againſt ſuch evil Agents of Strife and Diviſion (ſuch as thy ſelf) that they ſhould be marked, as well as a condeſcention to weak (yet upright-hearted) Brethren.

11*thly*, In the Certificate, printed by thee from *Huntington*-Meeting, to the Quarterly-Meeting in the Iſle of *Ely*, about the ſaid *R. S.* his publiſhing his Intentions of taking to Wife *A. O.* of *Aldred*, but grieved ſome Friends by rejecting their Counſel; After *ſome Friends*, there's this Parentheſis added, viz. [*Perhaps* Richard Jobſon *and* Tobias Hardmeat, G. Fox's *two principal Studs in that Country.*] This looks like a ſcornful Forgery of thy own framing and addition; And I find no Advertiſement to diſtinguiſh or except it as thy own, as thou haſt done in thy Letter to *W. P.* about the Copy of Orders Recorded as *Your Canon* (as thou ſcornfully calleſt

them) *in the Quarterly——verbatim, Parentheſis excepted* (ſayſt thou) p. 139. Remember thou haſt confeſſed, *That to expoſe and falſly repreſent a People, would be very wicked; and ſuch a Practice is, and ever was hated of God & good men*, p. 208. Yet after thou haſt promiſed to recite the ſaid Certificate, p. 96. thou haſt, as before, inſerted the ſaid ſcornful Parentheſis, viz. [*Perhaps* R. Jobſon *and* T. Hardmeat, G. Fox's *two principal Studs in that Country*] p. 97, 98. Unto which thou haſt ſubſcribed *Jaſper Robins, Edward Neel, William Whitehead, James Parris, Thomas Bundy, Richard Tayler, Thomas Bagly, Nathaniel Cawthorn, Nathaniel Neel.* Now I am perſwaded, that theſe very Perſons, *Jaſper Robins*, and the reſt, if they come to obſerve the ſaid ſcornful Parentheſis inſerted in their ſaid Certificate, unto which their Names are ſubſcribed, as well as the reſt of it, and that without ſuch Advertiſement or Exception, as before, they'l look upon it, and judge it as thy own Scurrility and groſs Forgery, and thereupon they may teſtifie againſt thee, for expoſing and falſly repreſenting them in Print, to that which is none of theirs, and that therefore thou haſt done that which is very Wicked, a practice that is and ever was hated of God and good Men, according to thy own Sentence.

12*thly*,

12*thly*, Whereas in thy printed Letter to Friends of our Meeting in *London*, thou ſayeſt, *That* R. R. *needed not be admired by* G. W. *in Print, for his great Learning, nor perhaps had not, only he hath found out ſome Hiſtory, or* Popiſh *Author, which ſayes, there were Deaconeſſes as well as Deacons; which* (ſayſt thou) *was helpful to* G. W. *in his Preaching and Diſputing for Womens Meetings lately in* Huntingtonſhire, *and elſewhere*, &c. p. 178.

Thou mighteſt have forborn theſe and other ſcornful Detractions, caſt upon *R. R.* and my ſelf, and upbraiding him with, *Oh! Profound Learning, Logick &c.* He can eaſily anſwer thy Impertinencies and Sillineſs, and evince thy Pride and Conceit, in meddling with *Learning* and *Logick*, which thou haſt ſo little of. As for *R. R.* he is known to be learned both as a Man and a Chriſtian; yet not admired by me for any acquired parts; though without offence, he may be allowed his due in thoſe things, without admiration or boaſting, and therein to be prefered to thy ſelf, who neither writeſt good *Engliſh*, nor underſtandeſt divers words of Learning thou makeſt uſe of improperly and impertinently, which I do not mention to detract from and upbraid thee, meerly becauſe of ſuch defect in Learning, but rather as a Reproof to thy

high Conceit, and buſying thy ſelf ſo much in Scribling, and that about matters beyond thy capacity to mannage, or render a Reaſon to decide, and that thou mayeſt ſee that there are others can ſee and diſcover thy Ignorance and ſhallow Conceits, as even in this thy Objection againſt Deaconeſſes, concluding, *That only* R. R. *hath found out ſome Hiſtory or* Popiſh *Author, which ſays, there were Deaconeſſes as well as Deacons.* In this thou haſt ſhewn as well a great deal of ignorance of Hiſtory, as ſcorn and contempt; yea, not only Ignorance in that, but Preſumption too, and as little Learning to be ſure, in other reſpects, to place the proof of Deaconeſſes ſo indifferently upon ſome Hiſtory or *Popiſh* Author, as if there were ſo little difference or diſtinction, but that if it be ſome Hiſtory, then it may as well be ſaid ſome *Popiſh* Author; however, thou knoweſt not whether it be ſome Hiſtory or *Popiſh* Author. But to correct ſuch Ignorance and Preſumption, there are Hiſtories and Authors which are not *Popiſh*, yea, divers *Proteſtant* Authors, which affirm Deaconeſſes to have been in the Primitive Chriſtian Churches, and they were called *Diaconiſſæ*; and even in *Rom.* 16. 1. *Paul* himſelf called *Phœbe* Διάκονον (i. e. a *Deacon*, which is a Word borrowed of the *Greek*) in Latin *Miniſtra*, in Engliſh *A Servant*,

Servant or *Miniſter*. I hope thou wilt not call *Paul* a Popiſh Author, writing ſo to the *Romans*. And on *Rom.* 16. 1. 1 *Tim.* 5. 9. *Deacon* is ſaid to be a Title of Office or Adminiſtration, given ſometimes *to Women*, vide *The Chriſtian-Dictionary*, by *Thomas Wilſon*, *Bagwell*, and *Andrew Simpſon*; to which alſo agrees *Edward Leighs Critica Sacra*, and *T. C*'s *Greek* Lexicon on the word Διάκονος, * given to Siſter *Phœbe*, in *Rom.* 16. 1. We have *William Cave*'s Lives of the Primitive Fathers for the three firſt Ages of *Chriſtianity*, and that even in the time of the Emperor *Trajan*, there were Deaconeſſes that ſuffered, that were examined upon the Rack (ſee *fol.* 21.) As alſo I find in a Book, entituled *A Brief of the Bible's Hiſtory*, by *Enoch Clapham*, Printed 1608. who writ againſt the *Romiſh* Idolaters, *fol.* 162. And in *fol.* 171. He thus affirms, "For the Deacons "all almoſt eaſily grant, that there were "two ſorts of *Deacons*, or Church-Servi-"tors; the firſt of Men, *Acts* 6. 3. &c. "1 *Tim.* 3. 8. The ſecond of Women, "1 *Tim.* 5. 9. &c. *Rom.* 16. 1. That the firſt "had the charge of gathering the Bene-"volence of the Saints (eſpecially every "firſt day of the Week, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1.)—— "That the ſecond attended the Sick & Im-

* Διάκονος. ὁ ἡ *Maſ.* and *Fem.*

potent, it is by many held. [Thus far this *Proteſtant* Author, beſides many other *Proteſtants* that might be cited in this very point, ſome whereof I told *R. R.* of, who ſays, He has many others he has not produced, and Challenges you to bring one approved Author, to ſhew that Women had no Service in the firſt Churches.] And though the *Rhemiſts* grant there were *Diaconiſſæ* or *Deaconeſſes*, I do not find that Dr. *Fulk* doth oppoſe them in that, but about their being concerned in the Sacraments, and in their Superſtitions, Nunneries, denying Marriages, &c. (as the *Papiſts* would have them.) For as to Deaconeſſes, and their Services in the Chriſtian Churches, there is great concurrence of Hiſtory, and antient and modern Writers, as well *Proteſtants*, (if not more) as *Papiſts*. And therefore thy placing it upon *ſome Popiſh Author*, does greatly manifeſt not only Ignorance, but rather Preſumption, Pride and Contempt againſt faithful Women's ſervice in the Church of Chriſt: And I can aſſure thee, that I had not theſe precedent (and other) Citations from *R. Richardſon*, but moſtly from my own ſearch and obſervations on the Authors themſelves; though *R. R.* may be better credited in his Affirmation on Knowledge, than thy ſelf in thy ignorant Negation.

13*th*, Again, I take notice of thy Charge againſt me, in thy ſaid printed Letter to our Meeting in London, p. 178. where ſcornfully writing againſt, and reflecting on *G. W. his preaching and diſputing for Womens Meetings in Huntingtonſhire.* Thou goeſt on in theſe words, viz. *Where he took too much upon him, and behaved himſelf more like a Lordly Biſhop, or Popiſh Prelate, than an humble Miniſter of Chriſt; and by me at this time is, and ſtands impeached as an Enemy to Chriſtian-Liberty, a Uſurper over the Conſcience, the which I ſtand ready publickly to aſſert, maintain and vindicate,* p. 178.

Thns far thou in thy inſolent Reviling and Abuſe, boaſting of thy pretended Impeachment againſt me: But I have met with no lawful nor due Impeachment from thee in any Goſpel judicial way. Thou writeſt thus againſt me to the Friends of our Second day's Meeting in *London*, but they cannot own nor receive any ſuch pretended and proof-leſs Impeachment againſt me npon thy bare Accuſation, nor that thou haſt any Juriſdiction to impeach me, as by thy unjuſtly comparing me to *a Lordly Biſhop, or Popiſh Prelate*, and rendring me *an Enemy to Chriſtian-Liberty, an uſurper over the Conſcience*: But this is but like thy accuſing me *as a Cheat, as having gone*

up and down to cheat the Country, after thou hadſt flatter'd and fawn'd in another Letter, and intreated my *aſſiſtance for the ending of the Controverſie, as one that could do much in the matter*; but now revileſt me all to nought, boaſting how ready thou ſtands *Publickly to aſſert, maintain and vindicate*. And what? But that *G.W. took too much upon him in* Huntingtonſhire, *and behaved himſelf more like a Popiſh Prelate*, &c. *An Enemy to Chriſtian-Liberty*. And what worſe Marks and Characters of Infamy couldſt thou have caſt upon me? and what more ſevere Excommunication or Bull couldſt thou have exhibited in Print againſt me? How *like* an exalted, malicious, prating *Diotrephes*? how like a Pope? how like the Accuſer of the Brethren haſt thou acted? Thou accuſeſt, ſcorneſt and raileſt, but proveſt nothing of matter charged: And can any reaſonably think thou haſt thy Proofs in readineſs againſt me out of *Huntingtonſhire*, of theſe black aud infamous Characters thou haſt caſt upon me? Thy own bare Accuſations are no Proofs to be ſure. The Lord rebuke this thy envious dark Spirit: And he will rebuke it.

But (*Francis*) art not thou thy ſelf againſt Chriſtian-Liberty of Conſcience? and an uſurper over the Womens Conſciences (ſo far as thou canſt) in thy perverſe

and

and ignorant oppoſition againſt Womens Meetings, who have a Conſcience towards God, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt therein? VVhat Liberty of Conſcience doſt thou allow them therein? or to me in preaching and diſcourſing in *Huntingtonſhire*, or elſewhere, thus to ſend out thy Roaring Bull againſt me in Print, without firſt either enquiring of me, or hearing me and my Accuſers (if there be any beſides thy ſelf) face to face? What kind of illegal Precipiancy art thou guilty of! and yet none more ready to make a great clamour againſt *Excommunications, Orders, Edicts, &c.* than thy ſelf? Oh Imperious, Proud, Conceited Perſon! Bluſh and be aſhamed of ſuch Abuſive, Inconſiſtent and Self-contradictory Work! Be aſhamed of thy aſſuming ſuch Power of Excommunication to thy ſelf over thy Elders, Antient Friends and Brethren, who are approved Servants of Chriſt. How like a Popiſh Prelate, yea, like the Pope himſelf haſt thou proudly, maliciouſly & imperiouſly acted againſt me and others of the faithful Servants & Miniſters of Chriſt Jeſus? Be aſhamed therefore and confounded becauſe of thy Inſolent and Slanderous Abuſes againſt the Innocent; and particularly of thy groſs Lye againſt me and others, viz. *That the holy Scripture is by us ſlighted*, p. 152. Be aſhamed, I ſay, of this abominable Lye. And

And for Confutation to thy abuſe of me before, read the following *Certificate* from Perſons of better Credit than thy ſelf.

Huntingtonſhire. *From our Monethly Meeting at* Godmancheſter, *the* 11*th day of the* 5*th Moneth*, 1682.

WHereas George Whitehead *hath been evilly traduced in two Letters of* Francis Bugg's, *and charged in one of them with behaving himſelf in* Huntingtonſhire *like a Lordly Biſhop or Popiſh Prelate, lately.* —— *Now we whoſe Names are ſubſcribed, do teſtifie, We never in this County, nor elſe-where at any time, ſaw any ſuch thing; and that he is a man far remote from any ſuch matter; but do believe he is a true Labourer in Gods ſervice, and an humble Miniſter of the Goſpel.*

Matthew Kay,	John Marſhall,
Samuel Nottingham,	William Starling,
Tobias Hardmeat,	Richard Snazdale,
Robert Liſter,	John King,
Jaſper Robins,	David Tiſoeth,
John Wilsford,	Thomas Lyſter,
John Averſett,	Richard Jobſon.

14*th*,

14*th*, And thy malicious ſcribling tends, in divers parts of it, unjuſtly to render us Obnoxious and Offenſive to Authority, by wickedly and falſly rendring the *Proceedings* of ſome of our Chriſtian Meetings *Tyrannical* and *Antichriſtian*, and comparing us to the *Popes Councils*, to *Popes*, *&c.* And all this to *Henry North*, Knight, and the Magiſtrates too, is next to proſecuting us for our Liberties or Lives.———

So diſguſtful may be thy trumpeting and publiſhing in Print the *Moderation of* H. North, *Knight*, (p. 194.) *and his mercifulneſs in taking notice of our threatned Ruin, and preventing it*, &c. as in thy Epiſtle Dedicatory to him, that doubtleſs we think *Henry North* as a prudent man will not thank thee for thus trumpeting *his Fame* abroad in Print, on behalf of *Diſſenters*; for ſuch kind of Oſtentatious dealing is offenſive and hateful to great Perſons of Prudence, who would not have their goodneſs expoſed to publick cenſure or reflection, nor be repreſented as Perſons Popular for any diſſenting Parties.

I have many more things material againſt thy Book; but I deſire thee to accept of my Labour and honeſt Endeavours; and what I have written thus largely to thee, as an act of Chriſtian Condeſcention and good

Will

Will for thy Conviction, that thou mayſt yet be abaſed and humbled unto Repentance and publick Condemnation of thy wicked and ſcurrilous Book, if the Lord will yet pleaſe to give thee an Heart to Repent and acknowledge the Truth, which thou haſt deeply offended and ſinned againſt with thy Lyes and Lightneſs.

And I deſire to know, if after the reading and peruſal of this my large Letter, thou art at all minded to relent and retract thy Book, or any part of it, and accordingly to give forth a plain Condemnation or Recantation as publick. To this I expect anſwer ſhortly from thee, otherwiſe trouble me not with any diſingenious or ſcurrilous Letters.

Thy Abuſed (yet Well-wiſhing) Friend,

George Whitehead.

London, *the 3d day of the 8th Moneth*, 1682.

Poſtſcript

Poſtſcript ſince added.

Wherein F. B*'s fallacy about the Record in the Quarterly Meeting Book in the Iſle of* Ely, *his abuſe of the Servants of Chriſt, his Contradiction about* William Penn, *his Scorn, Malice and Ranting Doctrine, are detected and reprehended.*

WHen I was lately in the Iſle of *Ely*, I made enquiry about the account which thou *F. Bugg* giveſt in thy Obſervations, pag. 52. *viz.* concerning a *Miniſter* (thou knoweſt who thou mentionedſt) *being recorded out of the Unity, for not taking his Wife according to the Order of Friends* (i. e.) *not publiſhing his Intentions before the Womens Meetings, as hereafter* * *will be further manifeſt* (ſayſt thou) *but not one recorded that ever thou remembreſt for any breach of Gods Commandments,* pag. 53. For which acount thou *refereſt any man to ſearch the Records of your Quarterly Meeting Book in* Hadenham *in the Iſle of* Ely, &c.

* Yet I find it not *So* manifeſt afterward in thy Book at all.

But

But upon my enquiry I find, that Friends do positively give a contrary account, and do plainly affirm, that there were no Womens Meeting *Then* at that time in being in those parts (or within that Monethly Meeting) in *Cambridgshire*, where the said Person lives, who proposed his Intentions of Marriage but once before the Men; And if so, thy account must be notoriously false, and thou mayst be horridly ashamed to divulge it, as also of thy frequently saying, *He was recorded out of the Unity*; whenas Friends only recorded, That *they have no Union with him in his so doing*, as thou hast cited it, pag. 63. which is only relative to that particular Act (*viz.*) of his refusing to come twice to the Meeting, and not in such general Terms to exclude the Person *Out of the Unity* in all respects: Therefore thou appearest fallacious in thy account.

As concerning the Paper of our sence and advice, dated, *London, the 27th of the 3d Moneth*, 1675. (consisting of divers particular weighty matters) which thou makest thy principal Instance of our *Apostacy and Violence upon our first Principles of Union*, and about which thou hast so much scosst and derided at us; I must tell thee, that I know not one Person who subscribed that Paper, but have cause to stand by it, and

W..

will ſtand by it, though unjuſtly and defamingly ſmote at, derided and contemned by thee. And why didſt not publiſh all our ſaid Paper? Thou ſayſt, *Thou haſt taken enough to ſhew our Innovations and manifeſt Apoſtacies*, pag. 50. as if all that Paper were matter of ſuch Proof; which is a moſt ſlanderous Inſinuation; for thou haſt not proved one of theſe Inſtances of our ſaid Paper either a *Violation to our firſt Principles of Union*, *Antiſcriptural*, or *Inconſiſtent with the Church-Diſcipline*, *Order and Government in the Primitive Times* among true Chriſtians, as thou pretendeſt, nor in the leaſt tending to *Apoſtacy* or *Antichriſtianiſm*. Thou haſt taken upon thee to ſtigmatize, brand and defame both our Teſtimony and the Subſcribers, particularly *William Penn*, thou haſt compared and rank't among ſuch *Unchriſtian Societies*, *Violators*, *Innovators*, *Apoſtates*, *Pope's Council*, *Arbitrary Authority*, *&c.* Thou art very loud in thy Charge, but mute in Proof, and wanting in Argument. And how doſt thou herein agree with thy ſelf, where in pag. 133. thou calleſt *Willian Penn*, **This Noble Man**, and in pag. 135. **Dear W. P.** and in pag. 144. thou prayſt for *William Penn* in theſe words, (*viz.*) *I pray God keep thee ſteddy, and with a continual Dependency upon the Divine Revelation, &c.* when thou haſt

haſt repreſented the ſame Perſon *W. P. Antichriſtian, Apoſtate, Innovator, &c.* as if thou ſhouldſt pray thus for him, (viz.) *Thou Antichriſtian Apoſtate, I pray God keep thee ſteddy.* Such Abſurdity doth thy Contradiction produce, who thus one while calumniateſt and revileſt, and anotner while flattereſt and prayeſt for the ſame Perſon; one while judging and condemning the ſaid Perſon as *Antichriſtian, Impoſer, Innovator,* &c. another while counting him *Noble Man, A Dear Man,* &c. Thou exclaimeſt againſt *Religious Societies, Excommunicating, Condemning a Perſon as out of the Unity,* when it was but that *They have no Unity with him in his* SO *doing,* (*i. e.* in his irregular Proceeding out of Unity and Order with them, in propoſing his Intention of Marriage but *Once* to the Meeting, and that in the Womans abſence) whilſt thou thy ſelf art (like an exalted *Diotrephes,* yea, like a *Pope* with thy printed Bull) *Excommunicating, Condemning, Deriding* and *Contemning* the *Servants of Chriſt* by Name in Print, as *William Penn, George Whitehead, Stephen Criſp, Alex. Parker, Thomas Salthouſe, John Burnyeat,* &c. for proceeding and giving their Chriſtian Advice, Sence and Judgment, according to their Conſciences and inward Perſwaſions, relating to good Order in the Church of Chriſt.

Thus

Thus inconſiſtent art thou, conceited proud Scorner and falſe pretender to *Liberty of Conſcience*, who haſt given more black Characters, and made a worſe (to ſpeak *ad hominem*) Record even in Print againſt theſe and divers other faithful Servants of Chriſt, than only for a Meeting to Record in Manuſcript their having *No Union with a particular Perſon in his Irregular Proceeding* in this or that particular act; for thou haſt recorded theſe before-mentioned Servants of Chriſt by name as *Antichriſtian*, *Impoſers*, *Innovators*, &c. and compared them to the *Popes Council* in Print, and that in thy Book intended for the Magiſtrates, as by thy Epiſtle appears, *pag.* 3. Thus inconſiſtent and contradictory to thy ſelf art thou in thy pretended Plea for *Liberty of Conſcience*, whilſt thou art Defaming, Condemning and Excommunicating many of the Servants of Chriſt among us, for the exerciſe and teſtimony of their tender Conſciences in their Chriſtian Advice and Admonition, which is all one as to ſeek to ſtop their Mouthes from preaching, exhorting others, &c. And this is not all thy Inconſiſtency and Confuſion, the fruit of thy Malice and Treachery; but thou haſt preſented ſuch a one as *Henry North*, Knight, and the Magiſtrates with ſuch abominable Lyes and Abuſes, as if (like a malicious

Informer and Incendiary) the Devil and thou deſigned not only the perpetual Reproach of the People called *Quakers*, but an Aggravation of their Sufferings and Perſecutions; againſt whom the chief ground of thy Book alſo is a *groſs Slander* and *great Lye*, (viz.) *That their way of Compelling, and Antichriſtian way of proceeding to bring to and force an Uniformity*, Epiſ. p. 4. And thus raging againſt our Friends in theſe terms, (viz.) *Theſe Tyrannical Proceedings have been uſed by our New Spiritual Lords*, Epiſ. p. 6. with much more Infamy, Slander and Scorn caſt upon us in thy Book, for which the hand of the Lord will be upon thee: Thy Envy and Wickedneſs is judged of the Lord; take heed how thou perſiſteſt in it, leſt he make thee an Example.

In thy ſixth Chapter thou art, according to thy wonted courſe of Malice and Scorn, inveighing againſt *our Womens Meetings*, falſly charging them *with uſurped Authority, unlimited Power and Rule, placed in their Meetings by* G. F. *and others*; which is a groſs abuſe and ſlander. Alſo thou art inveighing againſt *preſenting Intentions of Marriage before them by both the Perſons*, p. 118, 119. And this is not all the Fruit of thy perverſe oppoſition, but in the ſame Chapter, p. 123. after divers Citations, thou bring-

bringeſt a compariſon or inſtance of *eating Fleſh or Fiſh, as being indifferent and free*; and then addeſt, that *Theſe with* ALL *other outward Works be Things Indifferent, and may be uſed, and alſo left.* I muſt tell thee (*Francis*) that this Poſition makes void all Chriſtian-Diſcipline, good Order & Church-Government, leaving all looſe and uncertain: And we are ſure thou haſt here aſſerted corrupt Doctrine, tending to practical Ranteriſm it ſelf; for here thou makeſt no exception; thy aſſertion is general, not only of eating of Fleſh and Fiſh, but of ALL other outward works, *that they be things Indifferent, that may be uſed, and alſo left:* See now if this be not ſordid Ranteriſm; this looſe, gain-ſaying Spirit leads into both, to thy own contradiction, where thou pretendeſt for *Church-Diſcipline, Order and Government*, as in thy Title page thou ſeemeſt to grant were *in the Primitive times*, (i. e. among the Primitive Chriſtians, as we underſtand.) But what Diſcipline, Order or Government in the Church canſt thou Conſcientiouſly plead, and be conſiſtent with thy Poſition (viz.) *That all outward Works be things Indifferent*, &c? How contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrine alſo is this? for all good Works, which God hath ordained we ſhould walk in; theſe are not indifferent to be uſed, and

alſo left; outward works of Righteouſneſs, Juſtice, Goodneſs, Charity, &c. commanded of God, are not Indifferent to be uſed and alſo left: Solemn contracts and engagements in Marriage are not Indifferent: Perſons may not break ſolemn Contracts, due and orderly Proceedings: Men may not leave their Wives when they pleaſe, as an indifferent thing. But this *Libertine Spirit* that gave out and printed the ſaid Ranters aſſertion, in placing ſuch Indifferency upon ALL outward works or things, as that they may be uſed, and alſo left, hath thereby caſt off all Bonds, Limitations, outward Diſcipline, Order and Government of Truth, relating to Converſation.

We have much more in reſerve againſt thy Book, which at preſent I do forbear adding for brevity's ſake, and refer the Reader to *R. Sandiland's* ſingle Anſwer, Entituled, *Righteous Judgment placed upon the Heads of malicious Oppoſers and perſecuting Apoſtates*, againſt thy malicious Book; and alſo to *Tho. Elwood's Antidote againſt the Infection of* William Rogers's *Book, miſcalled, The Chriſtian-Quaker*, &c. Your Envy, Confuſions, perverſe *in-and-out* ways and hard Speeches are judged by the Lord, and his Hand is againſt you therein; and I queſtion not but God will more ſignally determine the Controverſie againſt that proud

proud contentious Spirit of Envy, Scorn, and falſe Jealouſie: And Truth lives, and ſhall live and reign over it all.

CHAP. VIII.

§. 1. Thomas Criſp *being joyned with* William Rogers *as a buſie Agent in Diviſion, as alſo his abuſe of* George Whitehead, *by part of an old Letter from* B. F. *The reaſon of their being linked together in this Treatiſe.* B. F. *his late Teſtimony on* G. W's *behalf againſt* T. C. §. 2. *Notice taken of a few Paſſages in* Thomas Criſp's *Pamphlets: The reaſon thereof particularly about Tythes: His unſound Propoſition: His Injuſtice unto and abuſe of* John Crook *in impertinently quoting his Authority in the caſe, contrary to* John's *Principle and Teſtimony* §. 3. *How diſ-ingenious* Tho. Criſp *is in his Authorities and Citations about Tythes; And how like his Brother* John Pennyman, *againſt our plain Language. Of* J. Pennyman's *furious roaring Letter againſt* G. F. *&c. containing the like unjuſt Reflections with* W. R. T. C. *&c. about* Impoſitions, Preſcriptions, *&c. The Spiritual Chriſtian, who hath the Power and Form of Godlineſs, diſtinguiſhed and vindicated, both from the*

Formal Christian and Loose Apostate, who deny both Power and Form. §. 4. *The unsound Doctrine of* Robert Rich *espoused by* T. C. *tending to Ranterism. About* Forms, Prescriptions, Impositions, *&c.* R. R. *a false Accuser like the rest of these Apostates: His Authority made use of by* T. C. *and* F. Bugg, *invalid.* J. Perrot's *Spirit and Language appearing in these present Opposers.* §. 5. *About* T. C's *Marrying by a Priest, and his Wife's condemning it: His rendring the holy Spirit contradictory to it self in the matter of Tythes: His Answer to* John Field, *dirty, scurrilous, and impertinent: His abuse of his Wife and Friends in the case, misrepresenting them in his Prejudice and Uncharitableness; judging and defaming others, contrary to his own warning. He himself reprehended and warned.* §. 6. *His endeavouring to extenuate his Offence about Marrying by a Priest, & paying Tythes. His Instance and Allegation in the case, but slight covers. And he proved Irreligious and Fallacious in his proceeding and arguing contrary to the Profession and Testimony of a real Christian-Quaker.* §. 7. *His Judgment about Tythes, as it accords with* W. R's, *still unsound & loose, & they not excusable in the Declension and Apostacy.* §. 8. *His Reply to* Stephen Crisp, *disingenious and fallacious. A Catalogue of some of the notorious*

terious Falſhoods and Slanders therein. His Reviling and foul Detractions againſt Stephen Criſp. §. 9. *Concerning the Paper which* W. R. *and* T. C. *have publiſhed and printed in* Edward Burroughs's *Name,* To the ſcattered of Iſrael, *&c. Their implicit Credulity and Confidence therein, and abuſe of* Edward Burroughs, *with Reaſons given by a Certificate and Teſtimony, to ſhew it in moſt probability to be* John Perrot's, *and not* E. Burroughs's *Paper: All which is recommended to Serious Conſideration.*

§. 1. WHereas *Thomas Criſp* hath of late time ſtruck in with *William Rogers* and his party, as a buſie Agent in Diviſion, and as hot and violent in his abuſive Language and Reflection, as the moſt of them, for want of better Argument and Reaſon, he is alſo gotten into the ſame kind of ſtile and ſtrain with *W. R.* and *F. B.* againſt *promoting Government, Orders, Cuſtoms, Forms, Preſcriptions,* &c. as in ſeveral of his late Pamphlets, called *Teſtimonies.* I find alſo that theſe Oppoſers have recourſe to one anothers Writings, and quote each other, and thereby ſhow their own Authorities for themſelves in the Controverſie, for want of better Proof, as *W. R.* cites *F. B.* in his

ſeventh Part, from page 64, to page 75. and *F. B.* quotes *W. R.* and *Tho. Criſp*'s *Babels Builders*, in his 112 page of his ſaid Book, *De Chriſt. Lib.* and *Thomas Criſp* in his fifth part *Babels Builders*, quotes ſomething he calls *Q. Un. M.* which I underſtand to be a pernicious Pamphlet of *John Pennyman*'s, which *F. Bugg* has threatned us with in ſeveral Papers * ſo that theſe Oppoſers ſeem to be joyned together in one and the ſame Spirit of Diviſion, Oppoſition and Separation, and therefore may well be linked together as Perſons concerned in one and the ſame Intereſt; and not only ſo, but I find a Paper in *T. Criſp*'s third Edition, which he calls *George Biſhop*'s Teſtimony, againſt a Paper of Orders, which is the very ſame Paper that *Jeffery Bullock* (ſome Years ago, cited againſt us, in his Pamphlet, ſtiled, *Antichriſt's Transformations*, and which the ſaid *Jeffery Bullock* did ſo publiſh in Print againſt *G. Whitehead*, *J. Whitehead*, *T. Green*, *T. Briggs*, *A. Parker*, *J. Coale*, *R. Farnſworth*, *T. Loe*, *S. Criſp*, *J. Moon*, *J. Parkes*, by Name, who are ſtruck at for no other cauſe, but a Paper, wherein we gave our Chriſtian ſenſe and ſeaſonable

*And whereunto we have a full Anſwer in being, in Manuſcript, reſerved (about five Years) in order to purſue and detect that of *J. P.*'s, if divulged abroad in Print.

ſeaſonable advice, which we ſee no cauſe to Repent of; and therefore *G. B*'s Paper cited by the ſaid *Jeffery Bullock* and *Thomas Criſp*, in oppoſition to that of ours, proceeded from a miſtaken Judgment and is, Uncharitable againſt us, as well as Erronious in divers parts of it † But the Author is gone, I ſhall ſay the leſs, and charitably believe God took him away in Mercy, and that if he had remained to this day, he would not have ſtood by theſe Gainſayers, in the evil uſe they make of his Paper in Print againſt ſo many of the Servants of Chriſt. But I have not done with *T. Criſp* for his ſo often printing part of a Letter from *B. F.* to me, when he was under a Cloud and miſtake in the Controverſie and Diviſion occaſioned by *J. Perrot*, &c. againſt Friends for putting off their Hats in Prayer; in which Letter I and ſome others are reflected upon, and charged, *That if ever any ſeparation be, it will be through mine, and ſome lording, rigid, driving Spirits*, againſt which I have in humility appealed to the Lord, to plead my Innocency in the Conſciences

† As in his oppoſing *Paſtors, Teachers, Elders*, &c. in our day, and the *Spirit* to them, and rendring us as *inforceing Orders, and ſetting our ſelves in the place of the HEIR*, &c. *And he was Anſwer'd in his Life time by ſeveral of the Servants of Chriſt who withſtood his oppoſition in this matter.*

ſciences of all concerned, my labour having been and ſtill is, for Love and Unity among God's People; and I take it not only unkindly from *T. C.* but as his Injuſtice and an Abuſe ſo often to bring forth that piece of a Letter in Print againſt me, which was before publiſhed and printed more fully by ſome malicious Adverſaries, in their Pamphlet, ſtiled, *Tyranny and Hypocriſie*, printed in the year 1673. In anſwer to which, I deſire T. C. and the reſt of the party concerned would now accept and conſider *B. F*'s own late Teſtimony, ſeeing the Lord in mercy has reduced him to a better underſtanding and judgment, than he was in when he writ the ſaid Letter.

Benj. Furly's Teſtimony follows.

WHereas I underſtand that ſundry perſons, to me unknown, have divers times formerly, and now again lately publiſhed in Print certain extracts of a Letter written by me, as I take it about ſixteen years ago to *G. W.* keeping up and feeding thereby a *Spirit of Contention and Strife*. This is in brief to ſignifie, That what has hitherto

hitherto been done of this nature, has been altogether without my order, consent or privity; for my soul hates that *Spirit* of *Prejudice, Enmity* and *Contention*, by which some men (though perhaps, poor men! not knowing by what spirit influenc'd, what spirit they gratifie, and what spirit they grieve and wound in this their work) so acted, led and driven. As for so many of them that are meerly under a mistake, I do from my heart pity them, and am touched with the sence of their Condition, as having laboured under the same snares. Wherefore my earnest desire for them is, That they may be made sensible of that which they seem so earnestly to contend for; yea, even for them that are so tinctur'd and leaven'd with Prejudice, that they do wittingly and with some degree of Malice, foment *Contention.* I cannot but desire, if it be the will of God, that they may through Judgment come to know Repentance, and through Repentance receive Mercy and Remission in and by the

Blood

Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, to whom all ſuch do doe deſpight.

And as for thoſe Papers ſo long ſince given forth by me, not diſcerning what ſpirit did then influence me (for ſo it is, that the actions of men are many times influenced both by good and evil Spirits, though they perceive it not, how much ſoever the Notion of Spirits, ridiculed by the *Atheiſtick Philoſophaſters* and *wild Wits* of this age) I did many years ſince recall them, and make it my requeſt, that any that had them in their cuſtody might make no further ill uſe of them; and to have found the contrary ſince, has been no ſmall grief to me, eſpecially to ſee ſo often repeated theſe perſonal Reflections by me uſed againſt *G. F.* and *G. W.* whom I truly honour in the Lord for their works and labours of Love.

However, I would not have any malicious Perſons from hence take occaſion to think, much leſs to ſay or repreſent, that I have hereby revoked, or do in the leaſt intend to inervate any of the words in that or any other Paper,

Paper, ſo far as they are aſſertive of a *juſt and equal Liberty of Conſcience.*

For I do firmly believe, *That there is no Principle maintained amongſt Mankind that ſtands upon firmer Foundations, that is more becoming the Rulers of this World in their reſpective Dominions, nor more agreeable to the Life and Spirit of* Chriſtianity, *than is that of* Liberty *of* Conſcience. Neither let any man on the other hand think or ſay, *That I do hereby in the leaſt hinder the Church of Chriſt from* judging, condemning *and* teſtifying *againſt things and Perſons by the Spirit of Chriſt, for preaching things which thoſe perſons erring from the ſpirit of Chriſt, may judge not only to be allowable as their Chriſtian Liberty, but even look upon to be their very duty.*

For as the Principle of *Liberty of Conſcience* is in it ſelf moſt reaſonable and chriſtian, ſo is this latter of denying **All Judging** upon any account moſt unreaſonable, blind and fooliſh.

And they that cannot ſee, that theſe two *Principles* of *Liberty* and *Judgment*, are not only conſiſtent, but very harmonious

monious with each other, are to be pitied for their weakneſs and half-ſightedneſs; of which perhaps, God giving life and ability, I may at another time ſay more — In the mean while I wiſh heartily, *that all that profeſs and name the Name of Jeſus, the Prince of Peace, would ſeek peace and enſue it.*

Benjamin Furly.

Now *Tho. Criſp* and the reſt concerned, ſee by theſe Lines how far *B. F.* hath diſtinguiſhed the point in Controverſie, and cleared himſelf upon a better underſtanding concerning the ſaid Letter, and againſt the perverſe uſe thou haſt made of it in Print to reproach me withal.

§. 2. And ſince thou haſt cauſleſly aſperſed me with it, and ſo far cenſoriouſly expoſed me in Print, as thou haſt done, when I ſought no occaſion againſt thee, nor deſigned Controverſie with thee; and ſeeing thou art grown ſo hardy and confident as to make thy ſelf ſuch a publick Agent and Advocate for W. R. and his Party in the Controverſie, I have not yet done with thee, but am concerned further to take notice of a few Paſſages in thy Pamphlets,

Pamphlets, which I look upon as very corrupt and perverſe, and contrary to our antient and conſtant Teſtimony, born among us on behalf of Chriſt.

The firſt is in thy Pamphlet, ſtil'd, *Several Teſtimonies, 3d Edition*, which is alſo printed in others of thy Pamphlets, in theſe words, *viz.* pag. 26.

I fear you take more care for the ſtrict Obſervation of your own Orders and Traditions than the Truth in the Heart; for if any uſe not your Language, or obſerve not to do juſt as others, in Tythes *or other* CIVIL RIGHTS, *which the Laws of our Land require, and ought to be obſerved, (unleſs God by his Spirit in the Heart doth forbid, or any do really for Conſcience ſake refuſe) But if one cannot do ſo, muſt he therefore judge his Brother? That may be required of one that may not be required of another; for Growth or Meaſure may differ*, Rom. 14.

AND J. Crook *ſaith*, 'We read of— 'Cain and *Abel*, two men performing the 'ſame Action, attended with the ſame For- 'malities, *&c.* and yet the one accepted, 'and the other rejected. In like manner 'may two Perſons be found in contrary '*Actions*, *Poſtures*, *Geſtures*, and yet both 'accepted of God; for if I ſhould lay a 'Bond upon my ſelf *therein*, I tranſgreſs 'the liberty of the ſpirit, either as to *time*, 'conſtancy,

'*constancy* or *place*; or if another ſhould 'lay a Bond upon me, or put a Yoke about 'the Neck of the Diſciples, this is no more 'juſtifiable than the former.

To the firſt part, being thy words, I muſt tell thee, thy Propoſition is unſound and inconſiſtent with our antient Teſtimony, as well as Contradictory in its ſelf: *Unſound* in that it beſpeaks thou art not principl'd againſt the Payment of Tythes in this Goſpel day, and haſt not retain'd a true or certain Judgment againſt them in thy eſteeming and accounting of them amongſt *Civil Right*, but *Rites* in thy other Pamphlet, *which ought to be obſerved*; and implying, that a Brother is not to be judg'd for obſerving (or paying) them. I am ſure this is contrary to the Teſtimony born and received among us from the beginning. And to thy granting, that God by his Spirit in the Heart may forbid them, or that for Conſcience ſake ſome refuſe them; as if the Spirit of the Lord did allow one Brother to pay Tythes as a civil Right, and forbid another; or that from a different Growth or Meaſure of Grace, one Brother may be required to refuſe the Payment of Tythes, and another Brother not ſo required, and therefore not to be judged for the Payment of them, being both under the ſame Profeſſion and Diſpenſation: Is not this

this Inconſiſtent & Babyloniſh, yea, and tending to apparent Ranteriſm, to render the Spirit and different Meaſures thereof ſo contrary and oppoſite in its requirings, in a matter ſo eminent & weighty as that of *Tythes*? wherein our manifeſt Teſtimony hath been ſo poſitive, and the Sufferings of many ſo deep and heavy for not paying Tythes, and whereof the very firſt breaking forth of the Light and dawning of the Goſpel Day did convince many Thouſands, when their Eyes were firſt opened to ſee the Corruption of that Miniſtry which is upheld by Tythes and forced Maintenance; therefore *T. C.* thou art gone from the Light that firſt convinced thee, in thus confuſedly arguing for Tythes; and thy Propoſition is looſe and fallacious, and there's no ſuch contradiction in the different Meaſures of Grace and Spirit received from God, as thou abſurdly implyeſt. If ever thou knew'ſt or waſt ſenſible either that Tythes were ended by *Chriſt*, or that the *Miniſtry* upheld by them is none of Chriſt's Miniſtry, thou couldſt never ſuppoſe that any meaſure or degree of his Grace or Spirit would allow or lead any (who have been really convinced of the Evil thereof) in the payment of them, if thou wert not gone from the true ſence and meaſure thereof in thy ſelf; for the different meaſures or degrees of Grace do not

alter the Property of it; and whatever it once manifests to be sin, and forbids as such, it always forbids, and allows none in the practice thereof; and whoever are truly convinced by the Grace of God, and have their Minds turned to it, if they keep in it, and walk in its way and teaching, they are principled by it, and are a Law to themselves therein, against those things, ways and works which are corrupt or sinful, and cannot place a slight Indifferency where the Truth hath made a real Difference; for what communion hath *Light* with *Darkness*, or *Christ* with *Belial*, or *Truth* with *Error*, or *Sincerity* with *Hypocrisie*, or *Sobriety* and *Watchfulness* with *Ranterism* and *Looseness*?— Consider how and from whence thou art fallen, and Repent.

To thy subsequent Allegation of *John Crook*'s saying, I must tell thee, that I look upon thee to have dealt *unjustly*, *disingeniously* and *injuriously* by him, and very impertinently alledged his words in this case, for thy unwarrantable, confused & loose Proposition for the Observation of Tythes, as a *civil Right* or *Rite*. I doubt not but he is better principled, even from the time of his first receiving the Truth, than to grant or allow any such liberty to any Christian Brother for the observation (or payment) of Tythes, as thy words import; and that thy Allega-

tion

tion of his words in this case, is contrary to his very Intention. I dare presume and appeal to his Conscience to give Judgment against thee in this case, whether the different or contrary actions, postures or gestures, relating to time, constancy or place, &c. mentioned by him, were intended with respect to *Tythes*, * the Payment or Non-payment of them. I dare say thou hast *foully* perverted his words and intention in this case; for the different *actions*, *postures* and *gestures*, relating either to *time* or *place*, may relate to divers things only circumstantial and indifferent, as to God, and not to things substantial, wherein Truth's Testimony has made a real Difference; As I, or any other in Truth, may be in different postures and places praying to God or waiting upon him, in Closet, on our Beds, in Field, Highway, either kneeling, standing, sitting or walking, and yet truly led, moved and exercised by the *holy* Spirit, and accepted of God, † which I

* For *J. Crook* hath given publick Testimony against the Payment of Tythes in this Gospel day, witness his Treatise, i. e. *Tythes no Property*, &c.

† But I must confess that in our publick Assemblies for divine Worship, such postures as bespeak the most Reverence to *God* and Union among our selves, are most commendable, edifying and exemplary, &c.

cannot ſay in relation to the *Payment of Tythes* in this Goſpel day, no more than in Sacrifice and burnt Offerings, ſince Chriſt hath put an end thereto. Thoſe things offered by *Cain* and *Abel* as *the fruit of the Ground* and *firſtlings of the Flock*, were things in themſelves lawful, and allowed in their day and time, and were alſo according to the Law of *Moſes*, being Types under the old covenant. But this can be no pertinent Inſtance, as alledged by thee (*Thomas*) in the caſe of Tythes, to obſerve (or pay) them in this Goſpel day, and as now in Controverſie; ſince both Tythes and Offerings were ended by Chriſt in his Death; nor is there any parrallel in the caſe, unleſs thou couldſt prove that the Spirit of Chriſt doth move Believers in this Goſpel day, both to the Payment of Tythes and the Non-payment (or refuſal) of them, which I dare ſay, thou canſt not prove. 'Tis not to be ſuppoſed that what *Chriſt* has aboliſh'd in the old Covenant he will enjoyn or command in the new; the Spirit of Chriſt is not contradictory to it ſelf, nor are Gods ſubſtantial Commands contrary one to another, eſpecially under one and the ſame diſpenſation and ſtate.

§. 3. Beſides thy abuſe and injury againſt *John Crook*, and Impertinency in this caſe,

I

I cannot but take notice how diſ-ingenuous, cover'd and fallacious thou art, in the management of thy looſe deſign, in reference to the *Perſonal Authorities* thou bringeſt, particularly in thy citing part of *John Wilkinſon* and *John Story*'s Paper concerning *Womens Meetings*, &c. in two of thy Pamphlets (viz.) thy ſecond and third Edition; in the 24th pag. of the laſt thou ſayſt, "*Theſe* "*foregoing Teſtimonies are not tranſcribed at* "*large, but abridged for brevities ſake, but* "*the SENSE AND SUBSTANCE OF* "*THE WHOLE included.* But *Thomas*, I muſt tell thee, this is a down-right Untruth; the Senſe and Subſtance of the Whole of that very Paper of *J. W.* and *J. S.* is not included in thy citation, although thou haſt confeſſed their Teſtimony to be *weighty Truths*, and haſt cited more paſſages than that concerning *Womens Meetings*; for thou haſt left out theſe Words of their Teſtimony, (viz.) "As to Tythes, we can in "truth ſay, 'twas never ſo much as in our "Hearts to ſtrengthen any in the Payment "thereof, nor yet to weaken the Faith of "any, having a Teſtimony in our Hearts "that *Tythes*, as at this day paid, are AN-"TICHRISTIAN. (Thus far they.)

How now *Thomas*? Why didſt thou leave theſe Words out of thy Citation? Was here nothing of the ſenſe nor ſub-

ſtance of their Teſtimony? or waſt thou not conſcious to thy ſelf, that their Poſition here againſt the payment of Tythes, and thy Propoſition aforeſaid for the obſervation of Tythes, as a *civil Right* or *Rite*, &c. were inconſiſtent and contradictory? their words are poſitive againſt them, as *Antichriſtian*, but thine are partly for them, and but doubtfully againſt them, that is [*If the Spirit of the Lord in the Heart forbid the payment of them*] or if the different meaſure of Grace require one Brother not to pay them, and allow (or be ſilent at) another Brother's paying them. Thus *Thomas* thou appeareſt in Confuſion a BABEL-BUILDER.

And what is our Language thou reflects upon? Is it the plain Language of *Thee* and *Thou* to a ſingle Perſon? And what are thoſe *Orders* thou complaineſt of, and thoſe *Cuſtoms, Forms and Preſcriptions?* Haſt not thou appeared like thy Brother *John Pennyman*, in thy empty and fruitleſs oppoſition? only he is a little more plain in his furious Roaring Letter to *G. F.* dated the 27th of the 3d Moneth, called *May*, 1680. printed among his other Letters *to divers Friends*, he furiouſly exclaims and roars out againſt us in theſe Expreſſions (viz.) "*Away with your long Prayers, and long Preachings, for they are an abomination; away with*

"*with your Pride and Arrogance, ſitting as*
"*Judges and Lords over your Brethrens Con-*
"*ſciences——Away with your ſet Form of*
"*Words of* THEE *and* THOU, *calling it*
"*the pure Language——O ye Blind and Ig-*
"*norant! how can you eſcape the Condemna-*
"*tion of the Juſt and Righteous One; who have*
"*ſet up Shadows inſtead of Subſtance, and*
"*Form inſtead of Power?—Builders of Babel,*
"*or Babyloniſh Builders—All your Buildings,*
"*your Inventions, Imaginations and Conceivings*
"*about your Forms, your proud ſelf-conceited*
"*Modes, your Impoſitions, your Preſcriptions,*
"*Laws and comely Orders (as you in your fallen*
"*Wiſdom call them) muſt all be thrown down,*
"*laid waſte, and become a By-word*
"*or Proverb of Reproach * to the*
"*very Heathen,* &c. (Thus far *John Pennyman.*)

* N. C's Epiſtle.

Theſe Words are cited to ſhow how far you Backſliders and Oppoſers reſemble one another in Stile and Language againſt us, crying out againſt *Impoſitions, Forms, Preſcriptions, Laws,* &c. but ſhow no Unjuſt nor Unrighteous Law, Form, Order or Preſcription practiſed among us; and therefore in your Madneſs and Fury are but beating the Air, and unjuſtly and falſly accuſing us with *Impoſitions, lording over our Brethrens Conſciences*: And *John Pennyman* he is for crying out, *Away with your ſet form*

of Words of THEE and THOU; he is offended at the Form of ſound Words; his Backſliding, Apoſtacy and vain Imaginations have been theſe many Years openly manifeſt, and time will further diſcover him to be a falſe Prophet againſt us: The Lord has brought us into that Form and Order, which neither Apoſtates, fallen Spirits, nor the Father of Lyes ſhall ever be able to throw down or lay waſte. We direct People to the Light and Power of Chriſt within, to guide them both in the Life and Form of Godlineſs, Form of ſound Words, and to obey from the Heart the Form of Doctrine received from Chriſt, and therefore we impoſe no blind Obedience, nor dark Formality upon any, but deſire that all may come to be living Chriſtians in Spirit, Life, Power and Holineſs of Converſation, that their Converſations may be as becometh the Goſpel of Chriſt; but you Backſliders are of diſobedient and looſe Spirits, elſe you would not rage, roar and foam out your own Shame as you do againſt the Servants of Chriſt, or that Form and Order which we are ſure he has brought us into, and wherein we are Conſcientiouſly concerned to follow our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in Humility; and herein we can diſtinguiſh between *formal Chriſtians* and *living Chriſtians*, and would have none

to

to enter into either extream of Formality without Life and Power, or under pretence of Life and Power to deny or oppose all Form and Order; for there may be a formal pretended Christian without Life and Power, but no real living Christian in Power without true Form; And this distinction we had from the beginning, and therefore alwayes believed that the true Power would not lead into any false or wrong Form, nor into any Disorder or Confusion, knowing that our God is the God of Order, and not of Confusion; he is the God of Love, Peace and Union, and not of discord or strife.

§. 4. And *Thomas Crisp* hadst thou kept to that which first Convinced thee, and raised up a love in thee to Truth, and the People of God called *Quakers*, thou wouldst not have espoused such unsound Doctrine as this of *R. R.* printed and published in thy Pamphlets among thy pretended *weighty Truths*, nor reckoned it among *sound Doctrines*, as thou hast done even in thy third Edition, p. 22. where after he hath confessed in these words (viz.) *I know that the Lord hath his People amongst them* (meaning those called Quakers) *as in* All Forms, *and such as love and fear the Lord, doing the thing which is just and right.* [The words which

which I chiefly take notice of, are these of his which follow, *viz.*] *And such are accepted with me as bone of my bone, and as my Brother* Benjamin *that came of the free-woman, and are in that freedom fitted to act in* ALL FORMS, † *as the Lord their Light shall lead them, that they may replenish the Earth.*

† So the Work of Backsliders and Apostates tends to fit them to hear and sit under the Parish Priests, contrary to the real *Christian Quaker*; Witness *F. Bugg*'s Proposition, espoused by him as his own judgment, viz. *Things Moral, under the Gospel men may be commanded by the Magistrate, as* HEARING *is an act purely* Moral. *A man may be commanded to hear the Gospel preach, without being forced to give his assent to it. The Light of Nature guides the Magistrate to instruct his Subjects in whatsoever he thinks for their eternal Good. And the* Light of Nature *obligeth every man to hearken, &c. A man that is only commanded to hear and receive Instruction, is dealt with as a rational Creature, and forced to nothing. The Judgment is still left in himself.* [Thus *F. Bugg*'s De Christiana Libertate, or *Liberty of Conscience*, pag 91, 92.] Whereby he has plainly given away and betray'd the cause of all conscientious Dissenters. For what place is left for Liberty of Conscience to dissent, if the Magistrate may thus enjoyn the Subjects to hear what he thinks is for their eternal Good, and they be thus obliged to hear, when he thinks 'tis for their good to hear the Parish Priests? By this Proposition, when the Magistrate commands *Fr. Bugg* to his Parish Church and hear the Priest, he is oblig'd so to do by his own Proposition, and reserve his judgment in himself, whether to accept or reject what he hears. Thus he may be in a freedom fitted to act in ALL

ALL FORMS. But then let him not eſteem himſelf a *Chriſtian Quaker*, but another ſort of a (Latitude) Chriſtian, whoſe Religion and Principle, before cited, will not oblige him to ſuffer any more as a *Quaker*.

This Doctrine or Propoſition I look upon to be very unſound, and tending to plain *Ranteriſm*, making no diſtinction in Forms, but including *ALL FORMS*, *without Diſtinction*, *under the leading of the Light of the Lord*: Which alſo is an abſurd begging of the Queſtion; for his Light doth neither lead nor fit the Children of the *free-woman* to act in *All Forms* † of Profeſſions, but in its own form or way moſt proper and peculiar to it ſelf, as *the Form of Godlineſs* is to *the Power of God and Godlineſs*, for granting the Lord may have a People that mean well under other Forms, as he has other Sheep that are not of this Fold: Howbeit, many that mean well are clouded and miſtaken, under wrong Forms, empty Shews, Ceremonies and Circumſtances, only of mens inventions and impoſing, which the Light of the Lord guides them not into, being but humane Traditions and Impoſitions of men, neither proper nor ſuitable to divine Worſhip, or to a true ſpiritual Chriſtian ſtate; and therefore it is not the freedom of the Children of the Free-Woman to act in *ALL* or any ſuch Forms, nor will the Light of the Lord

Lord lead them therein; nor may *R. R*'s words be applied to the Children of *New Jeruſalem*, who under the diſpenſation and order of the new Covenant, nor are they properly applicable to them, where he ſaith, *Why may not God enjoyn that as an Ordinance to day, and give his Power to it alſo, which to Morrow he will lay aſide as uſeleſs, and by his withdrawing his Power from it, leave it no better than an Idol?* as in pag. 19, 20. of thy 3d Edition. This cannot be truly ſaid of the Ordinances of the new Covenant, which are not to be compared to the Shadows under the old; and therefore theſe his Expreſſions, as applied to this Diſpenſation which we are under (which is that of the Goſpel and new Covenant) do tend to lead into Uncertainty, Inſtability, Looſeneſs and Ranteriſm. Good Works are ordained of God, the practice of pure Religion he enjoyns us to walk in; and he will not forſake the Children of the Free-Woman, who therein ſerve him in his free Spirit.

This R. R. whoſe pretended Teſtimony thou haſt eſpouſed, his exclaiming, accuſing and ſmiting unjuſtly, alſo like the reſt of you about *Impoſing upon Brethrens Conſciences, Preſcriptions, Impoſitions*, and falſly accuſing Friends with *the Spirit of Dominion and Rule over the Conſcience:* Telling of the

Yoke

Yoke of your Preſcriptions, your carnal and literal Impoſitions: G. F's *comely Order*; G. F. *and his Tribe of Proſelites; creating a Dominion over your Brethren, and the movings of God in them, and claiming a power to judge of all Differences, preſcribing Rules and Orders, &c.* falſly comparing Friends with *the Pope himſelf*, and accuſing them with *ſwelling Soveraignity over the Minds and Conſciences of men, heavily impoſing upon others in ſuch Circumſtances and Indifferences wherein the Kingdom of God doth not conſiſt, &c.*

With many more Falſhoods and unjuſt Reflections, and Abuſes, * without innumerating or giving particular Inſtances of thoſe *Impoſitions, Rules & Orders* complained of, only bids us *witneſs the Hat*; which I take to be becauſe we could not own *J. Perrot* and his party in their keeping on their Hats in publick Prayer: *R. Rich* being one of his Party, a Diſciple and Agent in his Cauſe, confounded in his Judgment with a Spirit (and Notions) of *Ranteriſm*, though ſometimes he confeſſed to the Power of God among Friends, but too lofty in his Spirit; he now ſeems to be adopted by you in his oppoſition (in this his Paper which thou haſt printed for a *weighty and ſound Teſtimony*, I mean, *Robert Rich*'s, whom I take to be thy Author) Why didſt

* The ſubſtance whereof is anſwered *fully* before to W. R.

didſt not ſet his Name, but *R. R?* which may ſtand for another Name, as *Richard Richardſon*; but we are ſure he is better principled than to write ſuch Airy, Looſe, Ranting ſtuff. One reaſon that makes me take it to be *R. Rich*'s Paper that thou haſt eſpouſed, 'tis ſo much in his floating, reflecting, accuſing, laviſh and conceited Stile; and alſo that thy Brother *Francis Bugg* makes uſe of his Authority in his Book *De Chriſt. Lib.* p. 170. in theſe words (viz.) *I begin to ſee the truth of* Robert Rich's *words in a Letter from* Barbadoes, *to his Friends*, Abſtracts, &c. *pag.* 20. viz. *I can aſſure you, that who meddle with the* Quakers, *had need to be fenced within and without with the whole Armour of God, Truth and love to Righteouſneſs*, David's *Sling and Stone, &c.*

Theſe Paſſages are mentioned that it may the more obviouſly appear how plainly you reſemble one another, and tread the ſame Track, in the Stile and Terms of your Oppoſition, and that 'tis no new Controverſie in the Subſtance; 'tis but only *John Perrot*'s Spirit of Diviſion riſen with ſome other Circumſtances and Pretences, in a more Rough, Lofty, Contemning, Hectoring and Huffing Party, daring and ſcornful, who have not that ſeeming ſhow of Humility, Lamb-likeneſs and

Out-

Outside Demureneſs, that *John Perrot* had, * the tendency and end of whoſe work, time will manifeſt more directly to center in *RANTERISM*, as it now tends to *FLESHLY LIBERTY*, caſting off the Yoke of Chriſt, and cauſing the *offence* of his *Croſs* to ceaſe.

*For tho *John Perrot* placed his oppoſition to the Putting off the Hat in Prayer very high, as on *expreſs Commandment from the Lord God of Heaven*, as againſt a *Cuſtom, Romiſh Tradition, and Trifle in the Apoſtacy*, as in his Paper which *Richard Hubberthorn* anſwer'd. Yet he had more ſmooth and taking Expreſſions to temper and gloſs his matters withal; as, *The Spirit of the Lamb is Poor, Low, Humble, Patient, Content, Temperate, Chaſte, willing to Suffer, full of Thanks-giving in all things, and of Pity, Mercy, Forgiveneſs, Love unto all, not holding Prejudice againſt any—and ready to lay down Life for all.—Now all that will follow the Lamb whereſoever he goeth, muſt be of this Mind, &c.* as in a Paper of *John Perrot's*. Now here was a more likely ſhew and reſemblance and pretence of Chriſtianity, than theſe *Lofty Scorners* do appear in, though he profeſt greater things than he poſſeſt; his Spirit was not in that Lowlineſs, nor was he conſtant with God. His Fall ſhould be a warning to many.

§. 5. And now *Thomas* I am not willing at preſent to ſpend much farther time with thee, thou having been ſo much anſwered by *R. Richardſon* and *J. F.* only I would ſhow thee a little further, how unfairly and diſingenuouſly

diſingenuouſly thou dealeſt with *John Field* in thy 5th part of thy *Babels, &c.* Firſt, I take notice of the account *J. Field* gives in the 3d page of his Book, entituled, *Thomas Criſp's Envy detected*, about thy Doctrine, and then of what thou ſayſt in relation to the ſame; and that which thou ſcornfully calleſt *J. F's Bull of Excommunication againſt thee*, his account is this, *viz.*

John Field ſignifieth, That *Friends have "no Unity with* Tho. Criſp *nor his Doctrine*, which is as followeth, "The 8th day of the "9th Month, 1681. *Thomas Criſp* ſaid, "*That he had lately paid Tythes, and that the "Spirit of God did or might allow him to pay "Tythes, or Marry by a Prieſt. And that by "the ſame Spirit of God another might be re-"quired not to pay Tythes, or not do the ſame "Things.*

"This *Thomas Criſp* ſpake the day and "year aboveſaid, and conſented to have it "writ and printed, and took a copy of the "aforeſaid words. Witneſs,

John Field, jun.

Oh *Thomas!* How haſt thou loſt true tenderneſs and the ſence of Truth? How art thou backſliden, and gone from that which firſt convinced thee of the way of the Lord and his holy Truth, which is but one? And how variable doſt thou render his

his Spirit, and contradictory to it ſelf in theſe great concerns *of Tythes and Marriage*? Is this like the Teſtimony of the *Chriſtian-Quaker*, as thou and thy Brother *W. R.* and his party would be rendred? Is it not more like exact Ranteriſm? Let all tender Hearts and ſincere Souls in the Light judge. But what ſayeſt thou to *J. F*'s Queſtion, *Why did thy Wife condemn it*? meaning your marrying by a Prieſt: To this thou moſt unrighteouſly and ſcornfully anſwereſt in theſe Words, (viz.)

"*But may not thoſe that pretend to ſell Par-*
"*dons, and pray Souls out of Purgatory (your*
"*Brethren) ſay, that if their Prayers and*
"*Pardons be not effectual, why have and do*
"*ſo many give ſo much Money for them? If*
"*a Woman gives all ſhe hath to have her Huſ-*
"*band out of Purgatory, an effectual Proof*
"*of the worth of the Pope's Pardon.*

Thomas, Thy Anſwer herein is dirty and ſcurrilous, & thy compariſon with the Pope, and thoſe that falſly pretend to pray Souls out of Purgatory, moſt unjuſt and ſlanderous: Be aſhamed of ſuch ſcribling and abuſive dirty Work, and falſly calling ſuch *our Brethren*: Be aſhamed alſo of thus unnaturally expoſing thy own *Wife* to an unjuſt cenſure in this compariſon (viz.) As to a Woman that gives all ſhe hath to have her Husband out of Purgatory: Oh ſordid and

bruitiſh! As alſo in thy following Words, and foul Reflection upon thy Wife (viz.) "*It is like SHEE, as too many more have, gave "too much credit to what ſome of* G. F's "*CHEATS ſaid: And ſhe is not the firſt that "hath been deceived by you, and perhaps ſome a-"mong you, that have prated others out of their "Money, might prate her, unto the writing "and giving you that Paper you pretend to.* Thus far thou in the 9th page of thy 5th part of thy *Babel.*

O *Thomas!* be aſhamed of thus *abuſing* thy Wife and others, (our Friends) with thy Railery in Print, as if ſhe were *cheated* or *deceived* into the giving forth the ſaid Paper in judgment againſt your marrying with the Prieſt; I am ſatisfied thou haſt moſt foully wronged her, as well as abuſed her Friends herein; for I am perſwaded that the Lord made her ſenſible you had done amiſs in ſo marrying, that ſhe was convinced in her Conſcience of the Evil of it, and of your wrong proceeding therein by the Light of Truth, before ſhe gave out the ſaid Paper; and that therefore thou haſt not only abuſed and unjuſtly expoſed thy Wife, thy near relation in Print, but alſo that thou haſt abuſed the Truth, and the real Conviction thereof in her: I dare appeal to the witneſs of God in her Conſcience againſt thy ſordid abuſe of her and

Friends

Friends in this matter. I find thou art a ſhallow impertinent Scribler and Railer, and uncharitably Cenſorious and Reviling in much of thy Work; thou haſt an abſurd and dirty ſtile of writing, if it be thy own, however it is patronized by thee. Remember from whence thou art fallen, and Repent of thy hard Speeches, Prejudice and Uncharitableneſs againſt Gods People, his Heritage. Thou haſt abuſed the Servants of Chriſt, have a care thy dayes be not ſhortned in Darkneſs and Sorrow. I am ſorry for thee. Thou canſt adviſe and inſtruct others to *Love* and *Gentleneſs*, and pretendeſt to ſhew *the neceſſity of bearing with, and not judging one another about ſuch things, wherein they differ in Opinion or Practice in ſome things*, viz. *outward and circumſtantial matters of Religion*; for that thou ſayeſt, *We may belong to one Shepherd, although not all in one Fold*; and confeſſeſt, *That Love is part of the Seal in the Forehead of the Lamb's followers*; *and ſo alſo Hatred, Strife*, &c. *the mark of the Beaſt*, as in thy *Introduction* to thy third Edition: As alſo page 13. thou giveſt Friends this warning, *To forbear judging any man any more, upon any pretence whatſoever*, as in the Paper thou haſt cited, and falſly calleſt *E. B's Viſion*. Yet contrariwiſe thou art ſeverely judging and con-

temning us on ſome *Pretence*; thou appeareſt in Hatred and Strife in the moſt of thy controvertial Pamphlets. May we belong to one Shepherd, although not all in the Fold as yet? Why then art thou and *W. R.* and *F. Bugg*, and *John Pennyman*, ſo ſevere in Judging, Cenſuring, Reviling and Reproaching many among us, whom we know to be the Servants of Chriſt? And thou telling of *G. F*'s *Cheats*, rendring thy Wife as one cheated and deceived by our Friends: Oh ſordid and baſe Confuſion, and Babyloniſh ſtuff! Seriouſly recollect thy ſelf, and give over thy falſe and fruitleſs Attempts, Impertinencies, and confuſed Scribling; for the Day is dawned and broken forth, that has made a diſcovery of the miſerable Apoſtacy and Darkneſs, which you contentious & quarrelſom Oppoſers are fallen into. Oh! come down, come down, and ſeek Repentance, and be humbled under the mighty Hand of God: May the Lord in Mercy give thee an Heart thereto, my Soul charitably wiſheth it for thee, &c.

§. 6. In thy Fourth Part, page 19. thou art endeavouring to extenuate the offence on thy part on thy Principle, that *one may marry by the Prieſt, and pay Tythes, and yet be a Chriſtian*; Thou ſhouldſt have added, [*One of the darker ſort of Chriſtians.*] But to

to excuſe the matter on thy part, *Thy Wife was not then one called a* Quaker, * *And thou couldſt not ſatisfie her, ſo that thou* CONDESCENDED *to take thy Wife in the preſence of a Prieſt, and acquainted him, that thou didſt it not on any account of Religion, but to anſwer the LAW*; and ſayeſt, *who* (i. e. the *Prieſt*) *very Chriſtian-like condeſcended to thee, ſo as not to ſay or do, or require thee to do or ſay any thing thou ſhouldſt be diſſatisfied with*, &c. *And you did before him declare you took each other*, &c. *nor was there half the Ceremony or Formality that is now practiſed according to* G. F's *Form*, &c. Oh *Thomas!* Theſe ſlight Covers, and Linſey-Woolſey Garments will not hide thy Diſobedience, nor excuſe thee from acting contrary to thy Conviction and Conſcience. It appears thou waſt marryed by a Prieſt [but to mince it, 'twas *in the preſence of a Prieſt*] though not in all Formalities; and this was thy CONDESCENTION: Was it ſo? Then thou waſt come to a higher ſight and ſtate than to be marryed by a Prieſt. May it not be ſaid further, how could it be conſiſtent

* But it ſeems *T. C.* was one then ſo called; and if ſhe was inſtrumental to induce him to Marry by a Prieſt, contrary to his Perſwaſion or Profeſſion, ſhe had alſo cauſe to Repent it, and may yet ſee more *cauſe to Rue it*, becauſe of his *Apoſtacy*.

with thy Principle and Profeſſion as a *real Chriſtian-Quaker* or *Conſcientious Diſſenter*, to be ſo Marryed? Mince it as much as thou canſt, 'twill not hold together. But *thou didſt it not on any account of Religion, &c.* No! how couldſt thou exclude that weighty concern of Marriage out of Religion? How Irreligious waſt thou then in it? Is there not as much need to keep unſpotted of the Word in the great concern of Marriage, as in any other concern in this Life? How couldſt thou then lay Religion aſide in this weighty concern? Is it not manifeſt **Ranteriſm** for a perſon to make ſo ſlight of **Religion**, as at his will and pleaſure to lay it aſide, and that under pretence of condeſcending in matters of greateſt Moment here wherein all truly enlightned and clear ſighted Chriſtians have moſt need to be Religiouſly exemplary, and faithful in their Teſtimony, according to their Conſciences?

But to thy Queſtion; *May not one Marry by the Prieſt, or pay Tythes, and yet be a Chriſtian?* For thy Principle, *That he may*, (in thy 5th part, p. 14.) thou giveſt us this Inſtance, viz. *I find* George Keith *very Chriſtian like ſay*, "I do not doubt but the Lord "had, and I believe he now hath many that "are precious to him, and that belong to "the *Catholick-Church*, even as I believe the

"Lord

"Lord hath many ſuch among *Epiſcopalians*, "*Papiſts*, *&c.* Alſo, I do acknowledge "the Lord hath among the *Preſbyterians* "ſome who belong to the true Church. *Surely then* (ſayſt thou) *theſe muſt be Chriſtians, and did and do Marry by or with a Prieſt, and pay Tythes.*

Now (*Thomas*) this Inſtance, and thy Inference upon it, are the moſt cunningly alledged of any thing I find in thy writings, and yet they will not do, they will not ſerve thy turn; for granting ſome among all theſe to whom the Lord hath regard, and who in ſome ſence may belong to his Church, it is with reſpect to their Sincerity towards God, and their fear of him, Conſcientiouſneſs ſpringing from his own Seed in them; and not with reſpect to their Formalities, cloud of humane Traditions and Inventions, which thy are led into by their Prieſts, as *Marrying by Prieſts, paying Tythes, &c.* Therefore, however the Lord in Mercy hath a regard to them for the ſake of the good in them, yet they are but *dim-ſighted*, and of the *darker ſort of Chriſtians*, who ſee not beyond thoſe humane Impoſitions and Traditions, as paying Tythes and Marrying by a Prieſt, *&c.* And for thee to excuſe thy ſelf therein, who profeſſeſt a higher ſtate and degree of Illumination (no doubt) as no leſs than *that of a*

Chriſtian-Quaker, thou mightſt as well argue, that there are ſome of the better and more ſincere ſort of *Papiſts* that bow to Images, and uſe many Superſtitions, which their Prieſts have miſled them into, and to whom God ſhews Mercy in ſaving their Souls at length; therefore thou or any *Chriſtian-Quaker* may bow to Images, obſerve Popiſh Ceremonies, *&c.* Or thus, There are many of the *ſincerer* ſort of *Epiſcopal* People that have their Children *ſprinkled* by a Prieſt, and ſigned with the *Sign* of the *Croſs*, that hear *Common-Prayer*, conform, and do all Conſcientiouſly, and are ſincere to God in their Way; ſo that in Charity we may conclude, that their Souls find Mercy with God at length. And what follows? Therefore *Thomas Criſp* as a *Chriſtian-Quaker*, and all other Conſcientious Diſſenters, both *Anabaptiſts* and others, may carry their Children to be *Sprinkled* by a Prieſt, have them ſigned with the *Sign of the Croſs*, hear *Common-Prayer*, *conform*, *&c.* and yet be good Chriſtians, precious to God, while thus inconſiſtent with their own Conſciences, diſſenting Principles and Profeſſion. Thus inconſiſtently thou mightſt as well argue for the *Chriſtian-Quakers* paying Tythes and Marrying by a Prieſt, *&c.* But I muſt deny the conſequence: Thou (as a *Quaker* doubtleſs)

doubtleſs) haſt known better things, and that as to the knowledge of Truth and degree of divine Illumination. There is no juſt Compariſon between a *real Chriſtian Quaker* and the beſt ſort of *Papiſts* and *Epiſcopalians*. Therefore thy pleading in thy 5th part of *Babels*, p. 19, 20. for *charity and forbearance to be allowed them who think it as much their duty to pay Tythes, as we do think it a ſin (and to thoſe who do Marry by a Prieſt, and pay Tythes, being of different Perſwaſion from us.)* Granting ſuch there are, who ſee no further, and are to be pitied; 'tis no argument for any that are of our contrary Perſwaſion to take liberty to *pay Tythes* and *Marry by a Prieſt*; for their ſin is greater than the other.

Oh Friend! thy Diſobedience, Declenſion and Apoſtacy from thoſe Diſcoveries the true Light has made, will not be excuſable by all thy ſlight Allegations in the ſight of the All-ſeeing and Heart-ſearching God.

§. 7. But—T. C's *Judgment about Tythes accords with what is in the third part of the* Chriſtian Quaker, &c. *by* W. R. *Chriſtianly and largely treated on* (quoth he) *in his fourth part, p.* 19. And what is W. R's Judgment or Doctrine in that caſe? Is it not *for freely paying Tythes to the National Miniſtry,*

ſtry, i. e. *not as by Conſtraint*; *yea, if any Perſon will freely of himſelf give a tenth part of his Eſtate or Encreaſe thereof to ANY USE WHATSOEVER, having no regard to any humane Inſtitution, or claim by any pretended divine Law*, &c. as his words are, 7th part, p. 52. Compare his Objection and Anſwer in that caſe, in his 2d part, *Chriſtian-Quaker*, p. 43. and the Apology he makes for it in his 7th part, p. 52, 53. together with our fore-going Replyes, then it will appear how looſe and apoſtatized thy Judgment is from the ancient Principle and Chriſtian Teſtimony of the truly *Chriſtian-Quakers*, whoſe Principle never allowed *paying Tythes freely*, (or otherwiſe) *to the National Miniſtry, or to any uſe whatſoever*. Therefore how little excuſable is your Declenſion, Apoſtacy, and looſe Doctrine in that caſe, who have ſeen and known better things from a farther degree of Illumination, than either the beſt ſort of *Papiſts* or *Epiſcopalians* have as yet received? Wherefore you, in ſinning againſt Knowledge, are more condemnable in thoſe things, than they in their Ignorance, blind Zeal, or Dim-ſightedneſs. So that 'tis high time for thee to bethink thy ſelf better, and Repent.

§. 8

§. 8. I could ſay much to thy Reply thou haſt given to *Stephen Criſp*, in thy *Babels*, 4th part, to evince how *diſingenuous*, *fallacious* and *abuſive* it is; but I find little neceſſity upon me therein, conſidering what little weight it is of, and how that *Stephen Criſp*, the Perſon immediately concerned, did not look upon himſelf ſo deeply concerned, as to think it worth the while to ſpend much time about, or take much notice of: Only I muſt tell thee, thou haſt abuſed both him, and thoſe of us who gave our Teſtimony, and plainly ſhowed our diſlike againſt the Paper and Subſcription from *Barbadoes*, which was not * *ONLY a diſlike of the Wording it*, (as thou falſly ſayeſt) but of both matter and ſubſcription: And therefore thy ſaying, * *There is no denial or diſowning the Principle of giving up all* (i. e. *Spiritual and Temporal*) *to* G. F's *Mens and Womens Meetings* (as thou ſcornfully accuſeſt us, p. 2, 3.) This is a groſs Untruth and foul Perverſion, and our Conſciences bear us witneſs to the contrary, that we do diſlike and diſown any ſuch Principle and Doctrine: Thou haſt miſ-ſtated the caſe againſt us herein.

* *First*

Secondly, As alſo thy Objection is falſe, *That we were more afraid of the Publication, than aſhamed of the Matter*, p. 6, 9. Seeing we

we ſo plainly manifeſted our Diſlike of the matter, in our Letter to thoſe of *Barbadoes* concerned.

Thirdly, As alſo a ſcornful and two-fold Slander it is, *That we endeavour to compel all to worſhip our Image* (as thy falſe term is) *of* G. F's *Orders*, p. 7. We deny both by terms and matter herein.

Fourthly, And likewiſe a groſs Slander and Abuſe it is, *That* G. F. *and his Party ſharply reprove others, who cannot againſt their Conſciences give up at the* Barbadoes *Church have done, and for not bowing to our Image*, G. F's *Laws*, p. 8. What a ſcornful abominable Lye is this!

Fifthly, Alſo theſe are notorious Falſhoods; *That we will drive them that will not follow us, contrary, or before the Spirit of the Lord lead them into our Ceremonies, elſe they muſt be Sons of Perdition, and all black Characters we can find to viliſie them*, pag. 10. Theſe are foul and falſe Accuſations.

Sixthly, Again, *That thou haſt to thy underſtanding endeavoured the Advance and Honour of that Truth we profeſs*, (i. e. *the Light in the Conſcience*) p. 11. This is an untruth; thy Vilifying and Abuſing (and Railery againſt) the Servants of Chriſt, who truly own and profeſs the Light for their guide, proves the contrary.

Seventhly, *That we are zealous for Forms*,

more

more than the Power, p. 11. Is alſo a falſe Accuſation and Slander.

Eighthly, *That* Stephen Criſp *is an Engine of Satan*, p. 12. And *A Forger*, p. 2. And *A bold-faced Lyar*, p. 4. appear ſlanderous Abuſes and foul Detractions, alſo expreſly contrary to thy own warning thou haſt given forth in *E. B*'s Name, for *All Friends to forbear Judging any man upon any pretence whatſoever*. However, *Stephen Criſp* is known to be a man Conſcientious towards God, a man more Righteous than thy ſelf, and I ſuppoſe better qualified, both as a Man, and a Chriſtian, than ever thou waſt; and thy envious Detractions cannot leſſen his Reputation, where he is well known. For the reſt of thy Abuſes, Perverſions, foul Detractions, Railery, and bitter angry Stuff, (in thy Pamphlets) which are not here recited, I leave thee to the Righteous Judge of all to reckon with and judge thee, as I doubt not but in due time he will.

§. 9. I hereby give the Reader further notice about that Paper before-mentioned, which *William Rogers* and thy ſelf have printed and publiſhed in your Books in *Edward Burroughs*'s Name, as *his Teſtimony, Viſion*, &c. concerning *The ſcattered of Iſrael*, the *Shepherd and his Dogs, and Sheep*, &c.

&c. and which in thy third Edition thou recommendeſt, *To be conſidered by all, more eſpecially by us called* Quakers, *among whom* (thou ſayeſt) *'tis proved to be a true Viſion, and not a Dream of* E. B's *making:* Shewing ſtill thy confident Credulity, that 'tis really *Edward Burroughs*'s Paper. I am ſtill the more confirmed that 'tis none of *E. B*'s, but *John Perrots*; and that *William Rogers* and his party (who encouraged the Publication thereof) together with thy ſelf, have been too credulous and confident, both in receiving the ſaid Paper upon truſt, and impoſing it on others as *Edward Burroughs*'s, and that therein you appear both implicit in your Faith, and meer Impoſers, as well as Abuſers of *E. B.* and his faithful Teſtimony, unleſs you can ſhew more manifeſt Teſtimony and valid Reaſon that the ſaid Paper was *E. B*'s, than we can ſhow to the contrary that it was *John Perrot*'s. It ſhall not ſerve *W. R*'s turn to ſlight a Negative Teſtimony herein, unleſs he and his party can prove their Affirmative, that *E. Burroughs* was the Author of the ſaid Paper, and that with more manifeſt Teſtimony and probable Reaſon than we have here to ſhow to the contrary, namely, that 'twas *John Perrot*'s: For beſides the Unſoundneſs of the ſaid Paper in Matter and Manner, before hinted, as one Reaſon that

'twas

'twas not *E. B*'s; obſerve the following Certificates and Teſtimonies from *Briſtol*, viz.

"I Having read and peruſed the "Paper of *The ſcattered of Iſrael*, "ſet down in *W. R*'s Book, ſtiled, *The* "*Chriſtian-Quaker*, to which *W. R.* "affixeth and ſubſcribeth the Name "of *Edward Burroughs*, as the Author "and Giver forth of the ſame. I re- "membring that I had read a Paper of "the like Import among the Papers of "*John Batho*, when living, did ſearch "into them after his deceaſe; and "among the Letters of *John Perrot*, "which *John Batho* choicely kept and "tranſcribed with his own Hand, I "found the ſame Paper above mention- "ed, without any ſubſtantial variation "of matter, with *John Perrot*'s Name "ſubſcribed at length, which if duely "weighed, and compared with the "Writings and Stile of *E. B.* and *J. P.* "ſeems, according to my beſt diſcern- "ing, much more likely to be the "Stile of *John Perrot*, than of *Edward* "*Burroughs.*

" *Burroughs.* Further, I am well af-
" ſured that the Hand-writing of that
" Paper is *John Batho*'s, which I have
" reaſon to know, by the many Years
" Co-habitation and intimate Acquain-
" tance that I had with him and his
" Hand-writing, who hath often ex-
" preſſed to me a more than ordinary
" reſpect to, and admiration that he
" had of *John Perrot* his Miniſtry and
" Writings, which occaſioned his Di-
" ligence and Care in tranſcribing his
" Epiſtles and Writings, of which he
" left a large Parcel behind him at his
" deceaſe. This I am a Witneſs of,
" and do give this Teſtimony, in or-
" der to the undeceiving of the Simple
" in that particular, and the vindica-
" ting of that worthy Friend *E. B.*
" from *W. R*'s Miſ-repreſentations in
" this matter.

Briſtol, the 2d of the 10th Moneth, 1682. } *Laurence Steel.*

" We

"WE, whoſe Names are here-
"unto ſubſcribed, have alſo
"peruſed and compared the above-
"mentioned Paper, touching *The*
"*ſcattered of Iſrael*, &c. with that
"*William Rogers* recites in his Book,
"entituled, *The Chriſtian-Quaker*,
"wherein he aſſigns *Edward Burroughs*
"to be the Author thereof; And up-
"on ſtrict Examination, we find it to
"be the ſame in Subſtance, differing
"only here and there in ſome Words,
"which alter not the ſence, and ap-
"pears to be only by the Writers mi-
"ſtake on one hand or other. We
"have alſo compared the ſaid Paper
"with *John Batho's* Books of Ac-
"counts, and divers other Papers and
"Epiſtles tranſcribed under his own
"Hand, and do moſt apparently diſ-
"cern that the above-ſaid Paper is the
"ſame Character with them, and the
"ſame Hand-writings. We alſo fur-
"ther teſtifie, that at the end of the
"ſaid Paper, *John Perrot's* Name, as

"Author thereof (and not *Edward* "*Burroughs*) is ſubſcribed at length "by the ſame Hand: And if *William* "*Rogers*, or any elſe, deſire a ſight of "the ſaid Paper, Epiſtles and Books, "we do freely offer our ſelves ready "to ſhew it them.

Witneſs our Hands,

Dated in *Briſtol*, this 2d of the 10th Moneth, 1682. } *Charles Harford*, *Richard Snead*, *Richard Vickris*.

SErious Reader, pleaſe to take notice, that ſince the writing of the *ſecond Section* of the *eighth Chapter*, containing a Charge againſt *T. C.* for his dealing unjuſtly and injuriouſly by *John Crook* in the aforeſaid citation, which I ſent him a true Copy of about Tythes, &c. as ſtated by *T. C.* I received *John Crook*'s own Anſwer by Letter, dated, 6th of the 10th Moneth, 1682. plainly importing his diſlike, and Teſtimony againſt ſuch publication of his Name and Citation, contrary to his Principle and Practice, ſignifying, *That if* T. C. *hath done him right in the Quotation, he is ſure he hath wronged him in the Intention, by making his*

his Words ſpeak any thing at all touching Tythes: And that his Paper, which is only in Manuſcript, (near twenty Years ſince, writ on another occaſion) *Cannot with any ingennity be referred to the Payment, or Non-payment of Tythes*: And that by a Book writ by him, and Printed 1659. againſt Tythes, together with his own clearneſs from the payment thereof, it is evident *He cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to favour the Payment of them.* Thus far *J. Crook* hath ingenuouſly and plainly intimated and given his judgment, which (compared with my Exception before) doth confirm it againſt *T. C.* his diſingenuous and injurious Citation, reflecting on *J. C.* and his Teſtimony, who concludes his Letter & Account in theſe Words to me, (*viz.*) "What I have "ſaid, may ſatisfie thoſe that are willing "to be informed aright; and for others, "that will not be contented, except their "Humour of Conceitedneſs be gratified, "they need not greater Judgment here, "than to be their own Tormentors, and "hereafter to be left to the Judgment of "the great Day, when every man ſhall re-"ceive a Reward according to his Deeds.

"Thy Brother in the Truth of the "Goſpel of Jeſus,

John Crook.

CHAP. IX.

§. 1. *Why notice is taken of* Jeffery Bullock, *in this Treatiſe; ſome Reaſons given.* §. 2. *His charge of mens Inventions, falſe Doctrines. Of the Church of* Rome, *&c. Viſible Church-Government, that's altogether Antichriſtian, teſtified againſt.* §. 3 *Chriſt's Government in his Church, how Inviſible and Viſible, vindicated from* Jeffery Bullocks *oppoſition to Elders, Mens Meetings and Womens Meetings, &c.* §. 4. *Our Reverence to God in our Prayers, and reverent Deportment and Conſcientiouſneſs therein, both in uncovering our Heads, Kneeling, &c. vindicated from his falſe Objections.* §. 5. *His fallacious dealing with our Doctrine about the Seed of God in man: The matter truly ſtated againſt his Falſhood.* §. 6. *Of his diſowning the ariſing of the Seed of God in man.* §. 7. *Our preaching Salvation and Juſtification by the Man Chriſt, the Son of God, and his being our Way to the Father, queſtioned by* J. Bullock; *here vindicated.* §. 8. *His Ignorance of the innocent Birth or Babe Immortal; and of Gods appearance and ſpeaking by his Son, and his oppoſing the inward feeling of Life.*

His

His ſlanderous repetition againſt us about God being held in Bondage, teſtified againſt, and the matter opened, as what it is that ſuffers, and what is in Bondage in man. His denying Chriſt to be the only Way to the Father again; with a Collection of his Erronious and Atheiſtical Doctrines. §. 9. *His oppoſing Juſtification, Salvation and Condemnation by that Chriſt that ſuffered, proved Erronious, and againſt his Mediatorſhip, and Scripture-Teſtimony.* J. B. *confounded about two Chriſts, &c.* §. 10. *His oppoſing Chriſt's coming of* David, *&c. And his aſſerting that his Soul dyed, that he internally dyed. And his holding the Mortality of the Soul of man, proved Erronious and Atheiſtical, and abundantly contradicted by himſelf and his Preaching.* §. 11. *His aſſerting the Scriptures to be the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, whimſical and erronious; and diſowning our Friends Book, Letter and Teſtimony, and yet confeſſing them to be in the Letter of the Scriptures, contradictory to himſelf and his Books againſt us.* §. 12. *His practical contradiction in ſeparating himſelf from others, and preaching in our Friends Meeting at* Sudbury. *His erronious* Denyings *and Doctrines ſumed up, and denyed by the true* Chriſtian-Quakers.

The Conclusion, by way of Solemn Appeal and Supplication to God.

§. 1. CONcerning *Jeffery Bullock*'s four Pamphlets, slanderously charging us with *Antichristian Doctrines, and an Antichristian Government, or a visible Church-Government that's altogether Antichristian*, as in his *One Blow*, pag. 9. &c.

Some may ask me, Why I take notice of such confused, muddled, blind, dark and mad Stuff, as his appears to be? To which I Answer:

First, Because neither the Truth, nor us, as a Religious People and Christian Society, may lie under any Dis-repute, Blemish or Derision thereof, in the Eyes of those that know not, nor rightly understand the Christian Doctrine, Discipline, Church-Government, and wholsom Order among us, seeing the said *J. B.* has been for many Years conversant among the People called *Quakers*, and born the Name of a *Quaker* (he saith) this twenty Years, and more: Though he IS NO *QUAKER*, but turn'd an open Enemy to them.

Secondly, Because the said *Jeffery Bullock*, in a great measure, runs parallel with, and resembles *William Rogers* and his party, in his opposition and gain-saying of that Order and Church-Government that is among

among us, falſly accuſing us with *Men's Inventions, Imitations, Traditions, laying aſide the Spirits Government*, &c. as in his *ONE BLOW*, &c.

Thirdly, Becauſe four Perſons of *William Rogers*'s Party * of *Chippinham* in *Wiltſhire* have given their approbation in a Letter to the ſaid *Jeffery Bullock* of his Books, particularly that called, *One Blow more againſt Antichriſt's Miniſters*; and have declared, that *ſeveral Friends have good Unity therewith*; Which I do not believe: And not only ſo, but this in oppoſition and contempt to others, whom they abuſively revile in theſe Words (viz.) *But here are alſo a company of called Friends, which are very much for* Foxonians *Orders, which may be called mens Inventions, that do make it their work to Defame and Calumniate all them as do not conform thereunto. Some of*

* Their Names I forbear expoſing at preſent to this monſtrous Birth they have adopted from *Jeffery Bullock*. But if they ſtall again ſuffer or encourage the reading of any ſuch Unchriſtian, diſingenuous and malicious Books (or Pamphlets) as *W. R's* 7th part, by any of their Party in Friends publick Meeting, (as I underſtand, was once done at *Chippinham*, which was a turbulent, irreverent, and mad Action) then they will more manifeſtly deſerve to have their Names expoſed, both in relation to that, and to *Jeffery Bullock* and *his Books*, &c.

which thou, and most of which we are in our Hearts perswaded are Servants of the living God, amongst which thou hast a share of being villified to be a bad man; although to us its no manner of Invitation for us to give Credit thereunto, &c ——Barnadiston *and another hath been here, their envious Darts fly very swiftly and secretly——If thou pleasest to send half a Dozen of thy Books,* &c. With other Aggravations in the said *Chippinham* Letter, shewing not only their approbation and owning of *Jeffery Bullock* and his Books, but also their bitterness of Spirit in villifying and reproaching others; although I understand they have been a little ashamed of their approbation of his Books, yet not that they have repented of the bitterness of their Spirits, nor condemned those villifying Reproaches and bitter Expressions in their said Letter, as *Foxonians Orders*, Barnadiston *and another*; *their envious Darts fly very swiftly*, &c. What scorn, bitterness, and rancor do such Expressions bespeak? Christ never taught them to give such Names to Friends as *Foxonians*, nor would they take it well to be so dealt by, nay, they would think much if they should but be called *Johannites*, and their reviling *Giles Barnardiston*, who was a peaceable innocent man, and of good Report, doth bespeak a great Prejudice and Enmity

mity to have entred their Spirits, which they ſhould plainly have condemned; their Letter is all perverſe, but I do not underſtand any ſincere or tender Retractation, or real Condemnation thereof given out by them.

Fourthly, Notice is here taken of *Jeffery Bullock*'s Pamphlets, to manifeſt the great Abſurdity that oppoſit dividing Spirit leads into, and to warn others againſt it. And why theſe Perſons ſhould ſo haſtily approve of *Jeffery Bullock*'s Books, or ſay, that ſeveral Friends have good Unity therewith, I know no reaſon, being in ſeveral things ſo Corrupt, Erronious and Atheiſtical, as they are, except it be with reſpect to the Oppoſitions therein contained againſt the *Church-Government*, *Order* and *Methods* among us, in oppoſing whereof, *Jeffery Bullock* was theſe men's Elder Brother. Concerning which, take a view of ſome Paſſages in his ſaid Pamphlet, viz. *One Blow more*, in his own Words.

§. 2. *Jeffery Bullock* ſaith, *And you my Brethren alſo ought to have Preached up God's inviſible appearance by his Spirit in our dayes, to be the end of mens Inventions, Imitations and falſe Doctrines: But inſtead thereof, you have preached up falſe Doctrines, and alſo ſet up*

up your own Inventions among the Quakers *so called*, p. 5.

Answer; His charge of *false Doctrines, and mens Inventions*, we utterly deny as slanderous: God's invisible and spiritual Appearance, and the Testimony thereof still lives among us in as high esteem as ever, against false Doctrines and mens Inventions. But herein *J. B.* resembles the rest of the Opposers, in the work of the *false Accuser* of our Brethren.

Jeffery Bullock. *My Brethren, I fear you are not past the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *nor yet of the Priests and Professors of* England [a false Fear] *There is as great necessity of Preaching up* Salvation *to the* Gentiles, *by God's invisible Appearance, who is a Spirit, and also his Spirit to be the end of all mens Inventions, Imitations, Traditions*, &c. pag. 6. [True, but misapplied] *Therefore I would have* G. Fox, *and the eleven Elders, who are preaching up false Doctrines, and also setting up their Inventions among the People called* Quakers, *as Rules*, &c. p. 7.

Answer; Herein he is a false Accuser still like the rest, and he's far louder in his Charges than in's Proof. False Doctrines and Inventions of men, both of the Church of *Rome* and elsewhere, we utterly deny.

J. B. *My Brethren, your visible Church-*

Government

Government is altogether Antichriſtian, & becauſe that every Member of the Church in God is to be both ruled and governed by the meaſure of Gods Spirit in them; and it is none of George Fox's, *nor yet the eleven Elders that is to be a Rule for the* Quakers *to walk by*, p. 9.

Anſw. His charge of *Antichriſtian* and *Inventions* we utterly deny, and teſtifie againſt as Antichriſtian; and he, and the reſt of his backſliding Spirit, and approvers of him and his Books, are never able to make his Charge good. However, here its plain that he oppoſes *viſible Church-Government*, becauſe of the inward Rule by the meaſure of God's Spirit, wherein he argues Erroniouſly, and contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrine and Primitive Chriſtians Practice: Both the inward Rule, and outward Order, and due Methods among them, all ſpringing from God's Spirit within, were not to draw them from a dependance on that Spirit, but to ſhew forth Obedience in Practice and Example to the holy Spirit and pure Religion, and therein to help one another, for which purpoſe the Holy Ghoſt made Overſeers and Elders, *The Elders that rule well are worthy*, &c. *He that ruleth with Diligence*, &c. *I left thee in* Creet *to ſet in order thoſe things that are lacking*, &c. But there were ſuch Apoſtates then as deſpiſed *Dominion*, and ſpoke Evil

of

of *Dignities*, even of thoſe Inſtruments and Miniſters, Helps and Governments, whom the Lord ordained and raiſed up and dignified in his Church; and ſuch are theſe Oppoſers now in the ſame Spirit of Oppoſition and Contempt.

§. 3. J. B. *And ſhe (i. e. the Church) hath no need of your viſible Government, becauſe ſhe is the Bride, the Lambs Wife; and ſhe hath no need of the Light of the Moon to ſhine in her, becauſe the Lord is the Light, and the Lambs Spirit is the Light of the Church that is in him: But your viſible Churches make uſe of the Light of the Moon, * that is, your Mens Meetings, and alſo your Womens Meetings, and the Orders which are ſet up by them, for your viſible Churches they are to be Rules to walk by: For the Women have power to order the Affairs of your viſible Church, as well as your Men; and this Practice of yours is altogether Antichriſtian, and ſo alſo is your Church-Government, becauſe it is the Inviſible man Chriſt, who orders all things in his Church by his own Spirit.——Thoſe who are Members of the Church in God among you, in time will abhor your Government, becauſe it is Antichriſtian; For you Elders do look upon you*

* That's a Whimſie; where proves he that? Or that the Light of the Moon is Antichriſtian?

your ſelves to be Judges, and that you have Power to determine things in matter of Conſcience, &c. p. 10, 11.

Anſw. Chriſt's Government in his Church is both Inviſible and Viſible, he governs by himſelf and by his Miniſters; all are not come to a ripe Age in him, there are many Children and weak Ones, who have need of helps in Government: Our faithful Mens Meetings and Womens Meetings were ſet up by the Power of Chriſt Jeſus, and in his Light he governs and rules among them by his own Spirit: And faithful, grave and ſober Women have power to be Teachers of good things, and to teach the younger Women. Chriſtian-Church-Order and Spiritual Rule were exerciſed among the Primitive Chriſtians, both Men and Women, who were Children of New *Jeruſalem*, the free Woman; the Inhabitants of this City are not without Order, or Miniſters therein. And therefore this Oppoſers *Blow* and Charge of [*altogether Antichriſtian*] againſt our Mens and Womens Meetings, is both Silly, Proofleſs, Slanderous, and altogether Antichriſtian, againſt Chriſt's Work (and appointment) in Male and Female; and as the Church-Government among us is Chriſt's Government, both revealed, ſet up, and ordained by him; none that are

and

and continue *true Members* of his Church, will ever abhor that Government, nor reject, ſlight or deſpiſe that promiſed Dominion and Judgment that he hath given to the Saints to determine matters of Difference, but only Apoſtates, falſe Brethren and deceitful Workers, and looſe Spirits; theſe will be ſmiting and accuſing the Brethren, deſpiſing Dominion, and ſpeaking evil of Dignities; yea, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw Diſciples after them, crying againſt outward Rule and Government, Forms and Order in the Church, whilſt they are ſeeking Maſtery, Dominion, Rule and Government to themſelves. As for our *viſible Church* and *viſible Church-Government* (or Order) ſo much oppoſed by this Adverſary, he talks blindly and ignorantly; for though the Church be Inviſible, as to the Spirits of Men, who are Members of it, and Chriſt's immediate Rule and Government in the Heart be Inviſible, yet there is a Viſibility both of the true Chriſtian Congregation, and good Order and Rule therein, proceeding from the Spirit of Chriſt within.

The People of God and their good Converſations and Order in Chriſt, are not all ſhut up in an Inviſibility, being as Epiſtles to be read and ſeen of all; and they as a City ſet upon a Hill, &c.

J. B.

J. B. *You do prefer your ſelves, and the Church in the firſt place before God, who is Light*—— *And have ſet up themſelves and their Church as Head, inſtead of God and Chriſt*, p. 12. *Their ſetting up themſelves and their Government, and are laying aſide the Spirit's Government and Authority*, p. 13. *Thoſe Elders who call themſelves* Miniſters, *look upon themſelves and their Image to be equal in Power and Glory, both with the Father and the Son*, Teſtimony againſt the *Quakers*, p. 3.

Anſw. Theſe are notoriouſly falſe and ſlanderous; We prefer the living God, and his Son Chriſt Jeſus before all, and do not lay aſide the Spirit's Government or Authority, but in humility reverence, and deſire ever to live under the ſame, knowing Self abaſed, and Images defaced and rejected by the Light of Chriſt Jeſus.

§. 4. J. B. *If any of thoſe called Teachers intend to ſpeak a few words commonly called Prayer, then the Women and the Men that are ſet in the Meeting, ſhall riſe up, and the Men will uncover their Heads.*——*Their Teachers have judged thoſe* Quakers *not to be real Members of their Church or Body, that have not done it* (*i. e.* uncovered their Heads) *And herein the* Quakers *in general have given more Homage, Reverence and Reſpect to the Words or Prayers of another, wherein there was no Life at*

at all, than they have done to the Word of Life it ſelf in their own Particulars: And this is Anti-chriſt's work, p. 14, 15.

Anſw. His concluſion is falſe and ſlanderous herein. We Reverence the Word of Life in our living Prayers, and not Lifeleſs Words; And why doth he thus judge any Reverent Poſture among us in Prayer, as that of Peoples Riſing up, and Mens Uncovering their Heads in our holy Duty of publick Prayer? This is like *John Perrot's* prejudiced Party. And how foully Contradictory to himſelf is he in thus uncharitably judging us for our Reverent Poſture or ſerious Behaviour, which is matter of Conſcience to us, when yet he'l not allow any Members or Elders among us to judge or determine matters relating to Conſcience? And cautions us in Chriſt's words, *Judge not, that ye be not judged*, p. 12. Oh, blind harden'd Man! how dareſt thou thus judge over our Conſciences, or falſly accuſe us with *leading People from the Power, to worſhip and reverence the Form more than the Power?* And then moſt falſly to add, *That this is the work of Antichriſt among the* Quakers, p. 17. Here thou haſt *ſlandered*, and ſhamefully *belyed* the People of God called *Quakers*, and haſt ſhewn thy ſelf not worthy of ſo much as the Name of a *Quaker*. Thou haſt long been a Reproach unto them.

J. B.

J. B. Poſtſcript to his *Antichriſt's Tranſformations within*, (viz.) *If any amongſt you pretend to be moved by the Spirit to go to Prayer, then both Men and Women, they either ſtand up or elſe kneel down, and the Men all pull off their Hats, which own your Form of Prayer; and herein you do both Worſhip, Reverence and Adore the Form outwardly, and the Words more than you do the Word of Life in your own Particulars.*

Anſw. An erronious Concluſion, and no natural Conſequence, either of our ſtanding up, kneeling or putting off our Hats in Prayer; for all theſe may be and are innocently and conſcientiouſly performed with Reſpect (and in a holy Reverence) to Almighty God, whom we breathe and pray unto by his own Spirit. Beſides, both Kneeling and being Uncovered have been practiſed among God's People and true Chriſtians in Prayer to him; ſo that theſe Poſtures are not condemnable in themſelves. How blind and ignorant therefore is this Gain-ſayer in his Oppoſition? Read *Pſal.* 95. 6. *O come, let us Worſhip and Bow down; Let us Kneel before the Lord our Maker.* And *Acts* 21. 5. *And we Kneeled down on the Shore and prayed*; ſee alſo 1 *Cor.* 11. 4.

§. 5. Having thus manifeſted the Heads of *Jeffery Bullock*'s Oppoſition to outward

Order and visible Church Government, &c. and how blind and irrational he is therein, Inconsistent, Erronious and Antichristian in his Judgment. Now take a view of the Doctrinal part of some of those Doctrines he oppoſeth, and what Doctrines he asſerteth.

J. B. *The ſecond falſe Doctrine by you Preached, and alſo Printed, is, That the Seed, Spirit, Word, or God, is both in Priſon, Bondage and Captivity, and to be quickned, raiſed, &c. and that the Bleſſing is to the Seed*, p. 2, 3. of his *ONE BLOW*.

Anſw. Herein he hath dealt unfairly and fallaciouſly; he hath not produced any Book of ours, or our Friends, wherein this Doctrine is Printed, nor proved where any of us have thus asſerted in theſe very Words, though much of his oppoſition in his Pamphlets depend hereupon. We deny the Doctrine that the *Word, God*, is either in Bondage or Captivity in the Sons and Daughters of men, but only that there is a Seed of God and of Chriſt that is oppreſſed, and ſuffers in many by reaſon of Tranſgreſſion [*a Seed of God*] is commonly our phraſe and terms in this caſe: God is greater, he is above all, he is God and Father of his own Seed and Birth in man, which is a *tender Seed*, a *lowly* and *innocent Seed*, of the nature of Chriſt Jeſus *as Mediator*,

diator, who hath planted of his own Seed in man from the beginning, even of his own *Life, Soul* and Image, &c. who was *The first born of every Creature*, who ſaid, *My Father is greater than I*: And from *this Seed* comes *a holy Generation*, in them that believe in his Name and Power. Read alſo the Parable of the *Sower, which was the Son of Man*, and of the Seed that fell, *ſome on good Ground, ſome on ſtony Ground*, and *ſome in High-way Ground*, &c. And alſo how *the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a Grain of Muſtard Seed*; as alſo the Parable of *the Pearl hid in the Field*, &c. And further, the Seed of God and Chriſt may ſuffer, and yet not be in Bondage nor Captivity; nor hath the Devil or Sin, power or dominion over Chriſt or his Spirit in man (as *J. B.* falſly infers againſt us) but over the Soul and whole Creature in Sin, for whom Chriſt laid down his Life, and took it up again, who gave his Fleſh for the Life of the World; *And every one that ſeeth the Son, and believeth on him, ſhall have everlaſting Life; and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day*, (ſaith Chriſt) *John* 6. 39, 40, 44. and *ver.* 54. Chriſt Jeſus is not brought into Boudage or Captivity in man, though he condeſcends to ſuffer and bear Affliction for his own Seed and Generation, to bring them forth; for *his own Arm can bring Sal-* Matth. 13.

vation to him: he can *take unto him his great Power* when he pleaſeth: Though *he was oppreſſed and afflicted, and his Soul was Sorrowful*, nigh unto Death, when he bore the Sin of many in the dayes of his Fleſh, & when the Iniquities of all did meet upon him, when he ſuffered on the Croſs; and he is alſo ſuch an high Prieſt as can be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, ſuffer with us, and be afflicted in all our Afflictions; many are alſo ſaid, *To pierce him, grieve his holy Spirit, crucifie to themſelves the Lord of Life afreſh*, and to *tread under Foot the Son of God*, &c. Theſe are certain Alluſions and Elegancies, intimating Chriſt's ſuffering, and alſo his being offended and grieved by the Contempt, Deſpight and Enmity of the Rebellious: And yet Chriſt cannot be properly ſaid to be in bondage or captivity in the Sons and Daughters of men; for (as in himſelf) he that was dead, and is alive, ever lives in Dominion, having power over all Fleſh, that he might give *eternal Life* to all that come unto him, & truly believe in him: 'Tis properly ſaid of the Souls of Man and Woman in the Fall, that they are in Bondage and Captivity; that they are in Priſon and Thraldom, till Chriſt bring them forth and deliver them: *Pſal.* 142. 1. *Bring my Soul out of Priſon that I may praiſe thy Name.* And be

ſure

ſure he that brings the Soul out of Priſon, does condeſcend to viſit it in Priſon. He that brings up the Soul out of the horrible Pit, does firſt deſcend or reach ſo low to fetch it up, or elſe it would alwayes remain th re.

§. 6. J. B. *Antichriſt's Transformations*, pag. 9. *The Seed is not to ariſe in man*—And p. 25. *I diſown the ariſing of the Seed or God in man.*

Anſw. A ſad Doctrine and State! That's becauſe the Enemy is ariſen to ſuch a great hight in thee, that thou doſt not own the ariſing of the Seed of God in thee: What Fruit canſt thou bring forth to God, if thou doſt deny the ariſing of his Seed in thee? 'Tis evident thy Heart is bad Ground, ſtony Ground and thorny Ground, in which the good Seed hath not taken Root, ſo as to ſpring up, and bring forth Fruit unto Perfection; for in the good Ground or honeſt Heart it takes Root downward, and brings forth Fruit upward. And they that take heed unto the Light of Chriſt in them, where it ſhines but as in a dark place, they come to ſee the Day dawn, and the Day-Star ariſe in their Hearts: And is not Chriſt Jeſus the bright and Morning Star? But thou, as an enemy to the Seed of God, diſowneſt the ariſing of his Seed in thee.

Howbeit, that *His Light doth ARISE: The brightneſs of his RISING: He ſhall grow up: Truth ſhall SPRING out of the Earth: The Sun of Righteouſneſs ſhall ARISE: The Day ſpring: Let God ARISE and his Enemies be ſcattered*, &c. *The Word of God grew: So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed.* Theſe are Scripture Terms and Language, though little heeded by thee: We ſhall ſee more of thy abſurd and erronious *Diſownings* and *Denyings* anon, concerning the *very Chriſt* of God, and the *Soul*, &c. But how comeſt thou to deny the *ariſing* of the *Seed* in man, when thou haſt eſpouſed and cited what *G. B.* writ as thou ſayeſt, *againſt that Paper of Orders*, &c. ſeeing he herein plainly ſaith, *The Revelation of God is to his Seed, and his ſecrets he reveals to it, for which he made the World, and for whoſe ſake it is continued; And now the SEED IS RAISED to reign over all.* (Thus far *G. B.* thy authority.) But how ſhamefully haſt thou contradicted him in this matter, in thy diſowning the ariſing of the Seed in Man?

§. 7. J. B. *You do preach both Salvation and Juſtification, and alſo Condemnation to us* Gentiles, *by the man Chriſt, the Son of God, as other Profeſſions do; and this Doctrine I would have you to prove, becauſe you preach*

Salvation

Salvation by Chriſt the Light within.——You Preachers do ſay in your Declaration, that the Son of God is come, and hath given you an underſtanding; the which Doctrine I do deny, ONE BLOW, p. 20.

Anſw. Thou that canſt not reconcile (or ſee the *conſiſtency* of) Salvation by the *Man Chriſt Jeſus, AND* by his *Light within*, art gone from his Light into Imaginations. Why haſt thou not better obſerved the Goſpel preached by the Angel of the Lord to the Shepherds, concerning Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, *Luke* 2. 11. *For unto you is born this day in the City of* David *a Saviour, which is Chriſt the Lord*; ſee alſo *Mat.* 1.21. Read alſo good Old *Simeon*'s Teſtimony, which he gave of the Lord's Chriſt, *Luke* 2. 26, 27, 28. And alſo read Verſe 30, 31, 32. *For mine Eyes have ſeen thy Salvation, which thou haſt prepared before the Face of all People, a Light to lighten the* Gentiles, *and the Glory of thy People* Iſrael. The true Chriſt of God is but one, though he hath appeared in divers manners, both in the Fleſh and in the Spirit; he is the Light; he is the Way to the Father; he is the Saviour; he is the one Mediator betwixt God and Man, even the Man Chriſt Jeſus, the heavenly, glorious Man, the Man that was promiſed to be for a hiding place, who in the dayes of his Fleſh, ſaid, *I am the Light of the World*—

And, *He that is with you, ſhall be in you.* As he was the eternal Word, the Son of God; the Life that was in him was the Light of men (*John* 1.) both before his coming in the Fleſh, and ever ſince, and therefore he was that true Light that enlightens every man that cometh into the World; he was given for Life and Salvation: This our one Lord Jeſus Chriſt is our Light, Life and Salvation, he is alſo Judge of quick and dead, that MAN by whom God will judge the World in Righteouſneſs; he that believeth not in his Name, is condemned already; and *This is the Condemnation that Light is come into the World* (i.e. the Light of the Son of God) *and Men love Darkneſs rather then Light*, John 3. ſee alſo 2 *Theſ.* 1. 7, 8. *When the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty Angels in flaming Fire, taking Vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Goſpel*, &c. Then ſuch ſhall know him their Judge and Condemner unto their deſerved puniſhment; ſee Verſe 9.

J. B. *You Teachers do hold forth to us* Gentiles *Chriſt the Son of God, to be our Way to the Father; The which Doctrine I would have you to prove*; One Blow, p. 20.

Anſw. What defidence and unbelief hath entred thee? Chriſt the Son of God teſtified, *John* 14. 6. *I am the Way, the Truth, and*

and the Life: No man cometh unto the Father but by me; and no man cometh unto me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him. Wherefore in that no man cometh unto the Father but by the Son, the Son is the way to the Father, and the Father's *drawing* or *teaching* reacheth unto *man*, before he come to the Son or Father, that he may be drawn and come to both. *No mans knows the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* Therefore Chriſt the Son of God, is the way to the Father out of *Adam* in the fall (if thou'l't believe him) and *'Tis by one Spirit through Jeſus Chriſt* (the Mediator) *that we have acceſs to the Father.*

§. 8. J. B. In his *groſs Errors detected, or many of the Doctrines of the leading* Quakers *diſowned*, as *coming from an Antichriſtian Spirit*, p. 1. he ſaith, *John Webb's Doctrine was, That God's appearance in the Sons and Daughters of men, is to beget and bring forth that innocent Birth and Babe immortal, &c. This Doctrine doth ſignifie that God's appearance is to his Son Chriſt Jeſus, and for the begetting and bringing of him forth in the Sons and Daughters of men; the which Doctrine I do deny.*

Anſw. Firſt, God's appearance in the Sons and Daughters of men, is not to bring forth a *nocent* Birth, nor a Babe that's *mor-*

tal,

tal, but an *innocent* Birth, and a Babe *immortal*. Except a man be Born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God: And whoſoever is born of God, doth not commit Sin, for his *Seed* remaineth in him.

Secondly; This innocent Birth, which God by his Spirit brings forth in the Sons and Daughters of men, who truly believe, relates to them and their ſouls, as begotten and born of the immortal ſeed, by the living word: ſo that this *Birth* is not Chriſt Jeſus; for he is that incorruptible Seed and Word of Life, which begets, forms and brings forth the Soul of man into his own Nature and Image, and ſo he renews his own Image in man, that believes in his Power; and ſo Chriſt may be ſaid to be formed in us, as in a myſterious and elegant way of ſpeaking: the property and effect being put for the cauſe; for *Chriſt* in himſelf hath all Power in Heaven and Earth given to him, and it hath pleaſed the Father that all fulneſs ſhould dwell in him.

J. B. *That God's appearance is in and by his Son Chriſt Jeſus to us, and that all are to hear the Son in them, by whom the Father ſpeaketh to them, and that the Son in us is our way to the Father; The which Doctrine I do deny.* His groſs Error, p. 1.

Anſw. Here thou haſt denyed ſound Doctrine, which is according to Chriſts own Doctrine,

Doctrine, i. e. *He that ſeeth me, ſeeth the Father alſo:* who *hath ſhined in our Hearts, to give us the Light of the Knowledge of his Glory in the face of Chriſt Jeſus: And my Sheep hear my Voice, ſaith Chriſt:* And *God hath ſpoken to us by his Son.* Thy denying God's appearing, and ſpeaking by his Son, and his Son to be our way to the Father: Herein thou haſt not only denyed Chriſt's own Teſtimony, but the bleſſed advantage we have by him as MEDIATOR.

J. B. *Another of their Doctrines is, That the* Quakers *ought ſo to wait upon God, as that they may feel the Life in them to flow from Veſſel to Veſſel, whenas they are met together to wait upon God. This was* Charles Marſhalls *Wife's Doctrine*, p. 2. ibid.

Anſw. This is neither falſe Doctrine nor groſs Error, as thou imagineſt, but ſound Doctrine; *Hannah Marſhall* knew better than thy ſelf herein; for they that truly wait upon God, both receive an encreaſe of Life from him who is the Fountain, and feel Life to flow from Veſſel to Veſſel; *He that believes as the Scripture ſaith, out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of living Waters; This ſpake he of the Spirit, which they that believe ſhould receive. And the true Believers all drink into One Spirit.* And there is among ſuch a ſpiritual and effectual Communication of Faith and Virtue, in the living Communion

Communion of the holy Spirit; all which thy dark Imaginations have deprived thee of.

J. B. *These Doctrines of the* Quakers *are false Doctrines and Antichristian, because that God's Appearance is not by his Son Christ Jesus to us*, p. 3.

Answ. Thou art guilty of Antichristian Doctrine, and Anti-scriptural also, in denying God's Appearance to be by his Son Christ Jesus, *The Mediator*; for what God is to us for our Salvation, and what good we receive from him for our Souls, and what we are unto him in our Obedience (as acceptable to him) 'tis all *IN* and *Through* our Lord Jesus Christ the *Mediator*.

J. B. *That God, who is a Spirit, should be held in Bondage and Captivity by his Creation, or by the Power of Darkness, is contrary to Right Reason——So that it must needs follow by plain Argument, that not only the Creature, but the Power of Darkness too hath had Dominion over God——contrary to sound Doctrine, and is Blasphemy*, pag. 5, 6. GROSS ERRORS.

Answ. This thou hast often unjustly and slanderously repeated upon the *Quakers*; and herein I testifie against thy Abuse, and dare Challenge thee to prove out of any of our Writings, that 'tis the *Quakers* Doctrine, *That either God is held in Bondage or Captivity*

ty by his Creation, or that the Power of Darkneſs hath Dominion over him. We utterly deny the Aſſertion and Expreſſions as Blaſphemous; but do ſay, the holy Spirit is *grieved*, and the Seed of God *burdened* by the Iniquities of the World, which ſuffering is in Condeſcention on Chriſt's part, and not for want of Power or Dominion over the Devil or Wicked men; for he bruiſeth his Head, hath Power to ſubdue, condemn and puniſh them, and his own Arm to bring Salvation to him.

J. B. *Another of their Doctrines, That all are to come to the Son of God, Chriſt Jeſus, whom they ſay is in them, and that he is the only Way to the Father; which Doctrine I do deny, becauſe it is God who both was and is a Spirit, which hath firſt appeared in and to the Sons and Daughters of men, after ſin, &c.—— Therefore every one is to be firſt turned to God in their own particulars, and NOT to the Son of God*, p 8. Groſs Errors.

Anſw. This Erronious Denyal and Doctrine of thine, againſt coming to the Son of God, as the only Way to the Father, is but the ſame reiterated over and over. The Father and the Son are not divided in the work of Regeneration. *I and my Father are one*, ſaith Chriſt: *No man cometh to the Father but by me.* But 'tis no marvel that thou haſt denyed Chriſt (*the Mediator*) to

be

be the way to the Father, and ſo oppoſed his *Mediatorſhip*; for thy Denyals and Oppoſitions appear more Groſs, Erronious and Antichriſtian againſt Chriſt himſelf and the holy Scriptures in thy *Antichriſt's Tranſformations.*

1ſt, *In thy not owning Juſtification or Condemnation by Chriſt* * *that dyed without the Gates of* Jeruſalem; which thou confeſſeſt to be *the ground and main Difference that aroſe between ſome of the* Quakers *and thee*, p. 10.

* No marvel if *Giles Barnardiſton*'s Wife did ſay *that ſhe trembled to hear the Blaſphemy that thou beldſt*, as thou ſayeſt; *Antichriſt's Tranſfor.* pag. 21.

2dly, In thy aſſerting, *That Chriſt's Soul dyed*, p. 19. * And ſo thy holding the the Mortality of the Soul in general.

3dly, Thy aſſerting, *That the Book of the Scriptures both was and is the fruit which the Tree of Knowledge bears*, p. 22.

4thly, Thy affirming, *That there is Two Chriſts*, p. 23. Thus thou argueſt.

§. 9. J. B. *It is no where written in the Scriptures, that we ſhall either be juſtified or condemned by that Chriſt which dyed without the Gates of* Jeruſalem; *but it is written*, By Grace ye are ſaved, *and* by Grace ye are juſtified; *and 'tis alſo written*, By the Light of the World ye are condemned; *and not by Chriſt*

Christ that dyed without the Gates of Jerusalem, Antichr. Transf. p. 17.

Answ. Here again thy erronious Blindness is apparent, who seest not how consistent being *saved* and *justified* by that Christ who is the very Christ of God, to whom all the Prophets gave witness, AND being *saved* and *justified* by his *Grace*; both which the holy Scripture testifie. Isa. 53. 11. *By his Knowledge shall my Righteous Servant justifie many; for he shall bear their Iniquities.* This was a Prophecy of the same Christ that suffered; and *Mat.* 1. 21. *She shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his Name* Jesus, *for he shall save his People from their Sins*; and verse 23. *Behold, a Virgin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a Son, and his Name shall be called* Emanuel, *which being interpreted, is, God with us:* And Luke 2. 11. *For unto you is born this day in the City of* David *a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* And that Grace by which we are saved, is that Grace of God which comes by Christ; see also *Tit.* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14. Where the saving Grace of God and *our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, &c.* are testified of; and therefore Salvation by that Christ, through his Grace are not *Inconsistent.*

J. B. *Now if Salvation be by that Christ that dyed without the Gates at* Jerusalem, *then*

are

are all the Gentiles *periſhed that were in the World before that Body came into the World,* Antich. Tranſ. p. 18.

Anſw. Thy conſequence is erronious; for that very Chriſt, the Son of God, was (and is) *Mediator* and *Saviour* from the beginning; his outgoings were from of Old, he was ſpiritually in being by his *Life*, *Light*, *Spirit* and *Grace* before he took upon him that Body prepared ofthe Father to do his Will. *John* bore witneſs of that Man *Chriſt*, ſaying, *He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me,* John 1. 15. And again, verſ. 30. *After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me:* Therefore the Man Chriſt Jeſus was before he came in the Body or Fleſh: He was that *ſpiritual Rock* which all *Iſrael* drank of; his Life was the Light of men from the beginning, and all the generations of the Righteous did ſpiritually pertake of the benefit of Chriſt as *Mediator*, both before and after his Coming in the fleſh they vertually pertook of the Sacrifice of the Lamb, of the vertue of the Blood of the Covenant for Remiſſion, and were ſaved by the Life of this *Mediator*; by Faith they pertook of the ſpiritual Advantage of his ſuffering and ſacrifice, who was *as a Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World*, and as (in the fullneſs of time) his coming

coming and ſuffering in the fleſh, and his tailing Death for every man, and his giving himſelf a Ranſom for all, were for *a Teſtimony in due time of God's great kindneſs to Mankind.* So Chriſt's coming in the fleſh an eminent Diſpenſation from God, ordained and decreed in great love to Mankind: So that thereby a greater and more eminent diſcovery and breaking forth of his Light and Glory in the Goſpel Day and Diſpenſation was manifeſt in due time, which *Glory* the holy ſpirit of Chriſt in the holy Prophets teſtified of, as that which ſhould follow his ſufferings; and in him are all Nations and Families of the Earth bleſſed and ſaved, who believe and walk in his Light.

J. B. *All the World was freed from their Offerings for ſin by that one Offering——reconciled to God by the death of his Son——But we muſt be redeemed, juſtified and alſo ſaved by a meaſure of the ſame Life that dwelt in the Son, in which Life the Son of God offered up his Soul and Body to be crucified to the Death a Sacrifice once for all* * *Then NO Salvation to the Souls of the Sons and Daughters of men by him that dyed without the Gates at Jeruſalem*, p. 19. Anti. Tranſformations.

* Theſe precedent words (except that of his *Soul*) are true; but not the ſubſequent.

Anſw. An erronious Inference ſtill, and

moſt blindly reiterated; for if we muſt be ſaved by that Life that was in the Son of God, how dareſt thou deny Salvation to the ſouls of Mankind by him that ſo ſuffered and dyed? ſeeing we are reconciled by his Death; who dyed and roſe again, and Death has no more dominion over him? And haſt not thou confeſſed that we are reconciled by his Death, ſo we ſhall be ſaved by his Life?

Well, by whoſe Life? by the Life of the very ſame Chriſt of God, who (as concerning the fleſh) was put to Death. And was his Death then no ways conducing to our Salvation? How are we then reconciled by it? Is Reconciliation no degree of Salvation? Surely thou art under great Contradiction and groſs Miſtakes in this matter.

To thy Objection, *That* Mary *ſaith, her Soul did magnifie the Lord, and her Spirit did rejoyce in God her Saviour*, p. 21. *And that God ſaid, Look unto Me all ye Ends of the Earth, and be ſaved*, p. 23.

This is no proof that his Son Jeſus Chriſt was *No Saviour*; for God ſaves by his Son; God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf; God works by the *Mediator*; and Jeſus Chriſt, who is the *Saviour* and the *Redeemer* is both truly *God* and *Man Inſeparable*.

But

But how comeſt thou off in anſwer to the Objection made againſt thee, (viz.) *If no Salvation by that Chriſt that dyed without the Gates of* Jeruſalem, *then thy Doctrine implyeth two Chriſts, which we do not profeſs, nor preach, nor own*; for in words thou over and over telleſt us of *that Chriſt that dyed without the Gates, and that he was the Son of God, the Chriſt of God, &c.* What ſayſt thou to this? Review thy following words:

J. B. (viz.) *Now that there are two Chriſts, it is plain according to the Scriptures; for there is both the true Chriſt and Antichriſt*, p. 23.

Rep. Oh, ſad and lamentable! How abſurdly, blindly and erroniouſly haſt thou anſwered here! The Objection or Queſtion againſt thee was not about *Antichriſt*, but about the *True Chriſt*, who is the *very Chriſt of God*, who was crucified at *Jeruſalem*, and is in his Saints (by his *Light*, *Life* and *Spirit*) whom thy Doctrine tends to render *Two Chriſts*, and ſo to divide the True Chriſt; but we teſtifie he is but *One*; As *to us there is but* ONE GOD, *the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him*; *and* ONE *Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. And of this *ONE Lord Jeſus Chriſt* the true Apoſtles teſtified as One and the ſame Chriſt, though he variouſly appeared, according to what is written of him, (1 *Cor.* 15. & 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 verſes)

verſes) of his Death and Reſurrection, and how he was ſeen of many, *And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo*, (ſaith *Paul*) *as of one born out of due time*, v. 8. This was ONE and the SAME CHRIST ſtill.

§. 10. J. B. *Now Chriſt he neither came of* David, *nor yet of* Iſrael, *according to the Fleſh; not as to his outward appearance as he was a viſible Man; but he came of* David *and* Iſrael *both, according to the Spirit: And this is the Spirit whom God hath exalted, both as a Prince and a Saviour*; Anti. Tranſ. p. 23.

Anſw. This is a groſs Miſtake, and Contradictory to plain Scripture; ſee *Rom.* 1. 3, 4, 5. *Concerning his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, which was made of the ſeed of* David *according to the Fleſh; and declared to be the Son of God with Power, according to the ſpirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the dead; by whom we have received* GRACE *and* Apoſtleſhip *for obedience to the Faith among all Nations for his Name*; ſee alſo *Rom.* 9. 5. But thou ſayſt, *He neither came of* David, *nor yet of* Iſrael *according to the fleſh*, quite contrary to the Apoſtle's teſtimony; Which ſhall People believe, thee or the Apoſtle? Surely not ſuch a blind, muddled, confuſed, dark and dull Soul as thou art. I wiſh thee (with the Light of Chriſt within, on the holy Scriptures) to recollect thy ſelf better,

better, that thou mayſt repent, and condemn, and call in thy muddled, confuſed, diſtracted, whimſical and mad Pamphlets, that would be the ſafeſt way for thee upon all accounts; for thou hait no matter of Religion to ſuffer for, thy hope being in this Life only according to thy Principle of the *Soul's Mortality.*

J. B. *He that dyed without the Gates at* Jeruſalem—*he was the Chriſt of God, being one with the Spirit of God; but it was the* Womans part * *that dyed, that was his* * Soul *and* Body.—— *Now Chriſt as he was a viſible Man, and made of a viſible Woman made under the Law, he* INTERNALLY DYED, *as to his* SOUL *and* BODY; Antichriſt's Tranſformations, pag. 19.

* What Scripture hath he that ſaith *His Soul was the Woman's part that dyed?* The Scripture ſays otherwiſe; That 'twas *according to the Fleſh, he was made of the ſeed of* David, Rom. 1. 3.

Anſw. Oh poor *Jeffery*! Whither art thou run in thy whimſical Conceits, and diſtracted Imaginations, one while to *DENY* Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, to be the Way to the Father; another while to *DENY* Salvation by him; another while to *DENY* the Immortality of his Soul; and here moſt erroniouſly to *AFFIRM, That his Soul dyed, and that he internally dyed as*

to his Soul. Oh! Antichriſtian and Anti-ſcriptural Doctrine! For though he was put to death only as to his Body, his Soul dyed not with it; for he ſaid, *Father, into thy Hands I commend my Spirit*, Luke 23. 46. ſee *Acts* 7. 59. And to the penitent Thief, *To Day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe*, Luke 23. 43. Therefore his Soul (or Spirit) dyed not with the Body, he did not *internally* dye, he dyed only as to the Body, being put to death as concerning the Fleſh, and roſe again the third day, according to the Scriptures; and Death has no more dominion over him. And although it be ſaid, *He hath poured out his Soul unto Death:* This concerned the travail of ſoul, and ſorrows of death, which he was under the ſence of, when he ſaid, *My Soul is exceeding ſorrowful, even unto death*, Matth. 26. 38. whilſt yet his *ſoul* was living and immortal in its own being, praying and making interceſſion unto the Father: For *pouring out the Soul or Heart*, ſometimes (in Scripture) imports an earneſt ſupplication to God, and travail in Prayer; *Pſal.* 42. 4. *I pour out my Soul in me.* And *Pſal.* 62. 8. *Pour out your Heart before him, God is a Refuge for us.* The *ſoul* of *Meſſiah* was poured out in Prayer and Supplication to the Father, whilſt in great ſorrow and deep ſuffering for Mankind, even when he bore the Sin of

many

many, and made intercession for the Transgressors. Thus his *soul* was poured out, and made an offering for Sin, that he might see his *Seed*, and the effect of his Souls travail, and be satisfied, and through all Reign with the Father in the same Glory which he had with him before the World began. So that the *Messiah* reigneth in Life, Glory and Immortality, blessed forever; and his Saints shall reign with him for evermore. *Isa.* 53.

But thy Error ends not here, in asserting that *Christ's Soul dyed*, seeing thou hast publickly opposed the *Immortality* of the Soul in my hearing, and the hearing of many more, and hast affirmed, *The mortality of the Soul of man, that it dyes with the Body.* And so denying future States, Beeings and Rewards of mankind. Thou knowest *(Jeffery)* I have laboured with thee at sundry times, and before several endeavoured to Convince thee of thy Atheistical Error in this very point; and many are my Witnesses therein: But thou hast appeared wilful, dark and pertinacious in thy blind, dark and confused Imaginations, whereupon I have exhorted thee, and do exhort thee, to give over Preaching, and telling People *of saving their Souls by the Word*, and *of raising of our Souls out of the*

Grave of Sin and Death, by the Light and Power of God within, when thou doſt not believe any *Immortality* of the *Souls* of Men, more than of a Beaſt, as I have told thee to thy Face; when the Beaſt dyes, there's an end. So what groſs Hypocriſie is it in thee ſo often to Preach in Friends Meetings at *Sudbury*, in oppoſition to our Friends, and to pretend, as if thou hadſt ſuch a great Regard to Peoples *Souls*, that they might be ſaved, raiſed up, and delivered from Sin in this Life, when thou haſt nothing further to propoſe to them, than only a Hope in this Life, a Happineſs in this Life, a Portion in this Life? which is ſo ſhort and uncertain, that the dayes of Man here are compared but to a *Shadow*, and to a *Cloud* that *vaniſhes*, and as *being ſwifter than a Poſt*, or *than a Tale that's told*, and *ſwifter than a Weavers Shuttle*, &c. So that if we have hope in this life Only, we are of all men moſt miſerable. But I cannot take thee as a Perſon conſiſtent with thy ſelf, in this thy *Atheiſtical* Doctrine of the *Soul's Mortality*, no more than in other things; for thou art manifeſtly inconſiſtent and contradictory to thy ſelf in this matter; for in thy Pamphlet (i. e. *GROSS ERRORS*)

Pſal. 90. 4, 6, 9. & 102. 11. & 103. 15. & 144. 4. See *Job* 7. 6. & 16. 22. *Iſa.* 40. 6 *James* 4. 14.

His Confessions manifestly Contradictory to his Doctrine of the *Soul's Mortality.*

(*RORS*) thou hast confessed, *That Christ's Soul never was captivated*, p. 4. And, *That the Blessing is to God's invisible Creation within the Sons and Daughters of men, as that cometh to be begotten by a measure of divine Life, into a true and living Faith; the which invisible Creation* (sayest thou) *or the Souls and Understandings of men and women, over the which Death, that power of Darkness hath invisibly reigned*, p. 3. And, *That Ministry which is sent of God, it is to the Souls and Understandings of Men and Women——That so their Souls may be turned to the Light, or measure of divine Life which hath appeared to their Souls*, p. 4. As also thou sayest, *That God's appearance is both to the Souls and Understandings of the Sons and Daughters of Men, even whilst they are altogether Children of the Unrighteous Nature and Spirit, for that very end, that so they may be quickned, and also raised up, and so come to be changed, they being made partakers of the Divine Nature*, pag. 7.

Query: How then dost thou affirm that such Souls are *Mortal?* This change in such Souls does not only bespeak their Immortality, but their being Immortally happy:

Is

Is not that *Soul* or *Birth* immortal that's capable of partaking of the divine Nature, or that doth partake thereof? Can that Soul dye with the Body, or end in Mortality? No, no; the very Souls of the Wicked, and impenitent workers of Iniquity, ſhall live in Torment, where the Worm dyeth not, and the Fire is never quenched; Chriſt's inſtance of *Dives* and *Lazarus* doth really intimate the two different ſtates hereafter; ſee *Luke* 16. 22, 23. &c. How groſly Erronious and Contradictory art thou in this point? and farther to thy own confutation, addeſt, (viz.) *Thus the Sons and Daughters of Unrighteouſneſs come to be made the Children of Righteouſneſs, they being changed, and alſo lifted up by the Spirit of Life from under the power of Death, into the Kingdom of God, with him to reign over the Power of Death, even as the Son of God did in the dayes of his Fleſh*, p. 7.

How now *Jeffery?* Theſe paſſages relating to the Soul's converſion, and their being made partakers of the Divine Nature, and being lifted up into the Kingdom of God, are ſome of thy better ſort of Preaching; but thy Doctrine of the *Soul's mortality*, or *the Soul's dying with the Body*, doth allow the Souls of the Children of men, even of the Converted, but a very ſhort ſtare, and uncertain time in the Kingdom

of

of God, if but in this Life only. O *Jeffery*! give over thy troubleſom, hypocritical Preaching in our Friends Meetings for ſhame, and never pretend ſuch a concern for the Converſion and Salvation of Peoples *Souls*, whilſt thou holdeſt this Atheiſtical Opinion, *That they are all Mortal.* Keep at home, and give over ſuch Hypocritical Preaching, for 'tis neither Conſcientious nor Religious.

§. 11. Now concerning the Scripture, thy Doctrine followeth.

J. B. (in his *Antichriſt's Transformations*, p. 22.) ſaith, (viz.) *For the Book of the Scriptures both was and is the Fruit which the Tree of Knowledge bears.* And in his Teſtimony *againſt the* Quakers *falſe Doctrine* (as he falſly calleth it) page 19. He ſaith thus, viz. *The Book of the Scriptures is part of the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge— I ſay, that the Book of the Scriptures is the Fruit that the Tree of Knowledge bears.*

Anſw. This Doctrine is not only Unſcriptural, but a dark, erronious Imagination and Whimſie of thy own: Thou knoweſt not whereof thou affirmeſt, and haſt plainly contradicted thy ſelf herein, by confeſſing not only, *That the Scriptures are opened by the Spirit of Truth*, but that *They were given forth by the Word of Life*, p. 22, and 29. Thou

Thou farther proceedeſt (like a whimſical, ſelf-oppoſing and contradictory Perſon) in theſe words, (viz.) *Let all that read your Book, and alſo the Letter that was given me, whiſh I diſowned (which Letter is printed in my firſt Book) and they may eaſily perceive that the Line of your Teſtimony is in the Letter and Book of the Scriptures, and not in the Light and Law written in the Heart.* Thus in thy *Teſtimony*, p. 19.

Here thou haſt at one daſh confuted and overthrown thy own Work, and knockt down thy own evil cauſe at one blow. Thou haſt undertaken to deteſt the *Quakers Errors, and many of the Doctrines of the leading* Quakers, *as Erronious*, *Antichriſtian*, &c. And, *To give a Teſtimony againſt the* Quakers *falſe Doctrine*, (as thou falſly calleſt it) even in the Titles of thy Pamphlets) but now confeſſeſt our Teſtimony is in the Letter and Book of the Scriptures.

Thus haſt thou denyed and oppoſed that Teſtimony which is in the Book of the Scriptures, and not only *So*, but moſt erroniouſly oppoſed the Light and Law written in the Heart thereunto; when as they do agree, and the Scripture cannot be broken. Therefore Repent of thy vain and *Antichriſtian* oppoſition. Another Contradiction is in thy following words (viz.)

J. B. *Your Paper to the Churches is not to be*

be owned by the Churches, inaſmuch as it was written from a ſight or a ſence, and not in and from the Spirit of Revelation: Now whatſoever is written, declared, or given forth in the ſight or in the ſence, is not to be owned. Antichriſt's Transformations, p. 2.

Contradictions.

And p. 25. ibid. *I diſown that to be any true Miniſtry for God, who in their Declarations do exhort both Friends and other People, to come to a ſence, and to wait in a ſence, and continue in a ſence; for God is not a ſence, neither is his Spirit a ſence.*

But in plain contradiction hereto, p. 9. *Lazarus was raiſed, and ſo muſt we be raiſed by the ſame Voice, Spirit and Power, muſt we come both to FEEL and Witneſs Chriſt the Light within, to be our Reſurrection, and our Life, by FEELING and Receiving his Power revealed from Heaven, &c.*

Obſerve; Here thou haſt confeſſed to the Truth of *Feeling* and witneſſing Chriſt, *Feeling* and receiving his Power, *&c.* contrary to thy oppoſing and denying what's written in the ſenſe, and exhorting Friends, &c. To *come to wait and continue in a ſence*, whereas there is a ſpiritual ſence and feeling of divine Life; there are ſpiritual Senſes to be exerciſed by the holy Spirit, to diſcern between good and evil. There is a ſpiritual

tual ſeeing, taſting and handling of the Word of Life, but thou haſt loſt theſe Senſes, thou art out of they right Senſes, which makes thee ſo Senſleſs and Nonſenſical in thy ſcribling, and full of rambling confuſed Whimſies, Deluſions and dark Imaginations, which are the effects of thy Diſobedience to, and Apoſtacy from the Light of Chriſt within, which convinced thee long ago.

§. 12. And now I would have thee obſerve thy manifeſt and practical Contradiction to a Paſſage in concluſion of thy *Groſs Errors, Poſtſcript.* The Paſſage is this, (*viz.*)

J. B. *It is an Antichriſtian Spirit in all which leads People (under what Profeſſion ſoever) to think of themſelves above others, or to be in a better ſtate than others, or to ſeparate themſelves from others, although their Souls may have ſeen by the Light within them beyond others; yet theſe ought not to ſeparate themſelves from others; for they have been Children of Darkneſs as well as others; for if they do ſeparate themſelves from others, then this holds forth a certain Teſtimony, that they do think of themſelves above others, and alſo to be in a better ſtate than others are in; ſo that this is all Antichriſt's work.*

Anſw. Why doſt thou then ſeparate thy ſelf from others, that is, from the Church of

of England? for by this Propoſition thou ought'ſt not ſo to ſeparate, nor to frequent the *Quakers* Meetings, nor to preach in them, whether thou thinkeſt thy ſelf in a better ſtate than thoſe of the Church of England or not, or that thy Soul hath ſeen by the Light within beyond them, as doubtleſs thou thinkeſt thy ſelf herein above them: On this Propoſition of thy own thou ought'ſt not to ſeparate, nor to preach in the *Quakers* Meetings. And if thou didſt not think thy ſelf to ſee with the Light within beyond them of the Church of *England*, there were no reaſon for thee then to ſeparate from them. Behold! thy Practical Contradiction and *Ranteriſm*, in thy Propoſition or Doctrine againſt ſeparating from others, on the account of ſeeing with the Light beyond them, which is to maintain a confuſed mixture and ſociety in Worſhip, between thoſe that ſee with the Light, and thoſe that ſee not with it, between the Seeing and the Blind, the Children of the Light and the Children of Darkneſs; for thy oppoſing a *Separation* from others is without diſtinction, and yet thou art in a *Separation* from others. Why ſeparateſt thou from the National Worſhip, and makeſt thy ſelf a Preacher at the *Quakers* Meetings in *Sudbury*? when they diſown thee,

thee, thy Preaching and Corrupt, Erronious and Antiſcriptural Doctrine? As,

Thy *Denying* Chriſt, the Son of God, to be our way to the Father.

Thy *Denying* Salvation or Condemnation by the ſame Chriſt that ſuffered.

Thy *Denying* the Immortality of the Soul of Chriſt Jeſus, or of any other Souls of Mankind, and affirming, *That his Soul dyed, and that he internally dyed, as to his Soul, &c.*

And thy aſſerting, *The Book of the Scriptures to be the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge.*

And thy *Denying* the *Ariſing of the Seed of God and Chriſt in man.*

And thy *Denying* to come to a *Senſe, and to wait in a Senſe in thy ſelf*, and oppoſing preaching from a ſight and ſence; as in thy *Antichriſts Transformations*, p. 2, 25.

Thy dark and erronious Doctrine and Preaching in theſe things the *True Chriſtian Quakers* utterly deny, with many other dark erronious Poſitions, Whimſies, Contradictions and blind Oppoſitions, Falſhoods and Abuſes, fooliſh and unlearned Queſtions in thy Pamphlets here omitted; as alſo thy Hypocritical Preaching in pretence, *For the good of Souls, For the quickning of Souls, For the raiſing up of Souls, For the converting of Souls, That Peoples Souls may partake*

partake of the divine Nature, and be lifted up into the Kingdom of God, &c. Which though this be the beſt ſort of thy Preaching, and in the beſt words thou haſt, yet while thou *denyeſt* the *Immortality of the Soul*, and concluded, *They all dye with the earthly Tabernacles*, and *ſo a total end of all:* This thy groſs and Atheiſtical Error is enough to evince thy abominable *Hypocriſie* and *Irreligiouſneſs* in the beſt ſort of thy Preaching. And therefore give over thy preaching in our Friends Meetings, hold thy Tongue, lay thy hand upon thy Mouth, keep at home, and ſeriouſly bethink thy ſelf, and remember from whence thou art fallen, and then condemn, retract and call in thy Erroneous and Antichriſtian Pamphlets. Remember I have herein given thee the ſafeſt Counſel, in Love and Friendſhip to thee, and to thy Immortal Soul, which ſhall remember me when thou art awakened under the hand of thy Righteous Judge, who is the Judge of all, to whom I can ſincerely appeal, and commit my Chriſtian and faithful Endeavours concerning theſe *Controverſies* and *Differences* with thee and the reſt concerned in this Treatiſe, you being all concerned in one Spirit of *Oppoſition*, *Prejudice*, *Strife* and *Enmity*, though thou haſt exceeded the reſt in thy Doctrinal part, in preſumptuouſly attempting ſuch an Antichriſtian Confutation

of the *Quakers* Doctrines. And with my ſolemn Appeal and Supplication I do Conclude.

O! Thou Heart-ſearching God and righteous Judge of all, unto thee I make my Appeal and Supplication, againſt this Jealous, Dividing, Rending Spirit that hath appeared in Strife and open Contention againſt thy Servants and faithful Witneſſes, and againſt that good order and ſociety that thou haſt been pleaſed to gather us into. Thou knoweſt the integrity of my ſoul before thee, and that I have waited for thy Counſel how to act and behave my ſelf in theſe matters, and that I have not ſought to exalt my ſelf, nor any Popularity, Party or Intereſt to my ſelf, but only thy Glory and the good of Souls. Thou knoweſt, that in the firſt place my ſoul hath ſought for Peace in the way of Peace, and for a quiet Compoſure of Differences, occaſioned

occaſtoned by ſome Self-willed and Luke-warm Profeſſors of thy Truth, whilſt there was any hope or probability thereof, before the oppoſite Party became open Adverſaries. And O Lord thou knoweſt I am not alone in this concern, many others of thy faithful ſervants have traveled in the ſame Chriſtian Spirit with me, for peace and quietneſs, and for a quiet end of Differences in Truth and Righteouſneſs: But thine and our Adverſaries have rewarded us evil for good, and to me hatred for my love.

And now, O Lord, behold how true love and tenderneſs is rejected by thy Adverſaries, and how thy holy ſpirit is offended! Behold and judge the bitterneſs of their ſpirits; Their Rancor and Fury, their Words of Hatred, Reviling and Slander againſt thy faithful Servants and Witneſſes; Their Diſregard to the Honour and Reputation of thy Truth, thy Name and People;

Their working against the Glory and Honour of thy excellent Name among us; Their crucifying thy Son afresh to themselves, and putting him to open shame and reproach in the Eyes of thy open Enemies and Persecutors of thy People.

Oh! Lord, Lord, look down, behold and judge for these things, shew thy Power in putting an end as openly to these Controversies, as they are openly forced out into the World by Apostates and Adversaries of thy Truth and People.

Thou knowest, O Lord, that though thou hast endued me with a Christian Spirit, and with Faith, Patience and Rejoycing under all my Sufferings and Tribulations for thy Name sake, and enabled me patiently to undergo the open Revilings and Infamies cast upon me, both by open, profest (and secret) Enemies; in all which I daily praise thy Name for thy Goodness. Yet thou hast also endued me with the Spirit of

Righteous

Righteous Judgment, Understanding and Zeal for the Glory of thy holy Name and Truth, and hast raised me up in defence of thy Gospel, to vindicate thy Truth and innocent People, who are Lovers of Peace and Union in thy Son Christ Jesus.

And now, O Lord, I humbly pray thee, preserve thy Lambs and tender Babes, and open the Eyes and unvail the Understandings of all whom the Enemy has deceived and prejudiced, who are mistaken in their Judgments, and not guilty of willful Opposition and Hatred; That they that have not sinned out their day nor become judicially hardened, may yet find a place of Repentance and Mercy, in returning to thee with Humility, true Contrition and Brokenness of Heart, that thou maiest heal their Backslidings, and love them freely.

O my God! in these my Labours and Endeavours, as I have eyed

thee and thy Counsel, and thou hast been with me, for which I praise thy Name. So I recommend all to thee, to manifest the real intent and end of all, and to plead and justifie my Cause, it being thy own Cause, and the Cause of thy whole Heritage: Amen, Amen, saith my Soul.

Ad-

ADVERTISEMENT.

FIrſt, Note, That where in pag. 158. of this Treatiſe, mention is made *That* G. F's *intention and ſence is by another hand ſpoken to.* That and much more is yet reſerved in Manuſcript againſt *W. R*'s abuſive Books.

Secondly, That whereas in pag. 205. it is ſaid, *It being now above ſix Weeks ſince the Letter was left at* Ely, *&c. and yet no Anſwer.*— It is now above three Moneths ſince, and yet no Anſwer received from *F. B.* being now (at the Printing hereof) towards the latter end of the 11th Moneth, 1682.

Thirdly, That this Treatiſe has been long in the Printer's hands, and not haſtened in the Preſs, becauſe of theſe Additions in the three laſt Chapters, to *Francis Bugg*, *Thomas Criſp*, *John Pennyman* and *Jeffery Bullock*; for the Anſwer to *William Rogers*'s *7th part of his Chriſtian-Quaker*, was writ in a ſhort time after it was out.

Fourthly, It is ſome queſtion whether two or three of the Names in pag. 250. be right, i. e. *Averſet*, *Snazdale* and *Tyſoeth*, by reaſon of their Names being badly writ in the Certificate ſent up.

Fifthly, Note, That where in the Poſtſcript, after the Letter to *Francis Bugg*, pag. 253, 4. and in his Book alſo, p. 52. he gives account of a Miniſter thus, viz. *That in the Quarterly-Meeting Book at* Hadenham, *they ſhall find a Record, wherein he is recorded out of the Unity, for not taking his Wife according to the Order of Friends*, i. e. *not publiſhing his Intention before the Womens Meetings.* Which Account is excepted againſt upon Friends poſitively giving a contrary one to me.

Let it be farther remarked, that *Francis Bugg*'s pretended Proof appears not from Evidence of the Fact, but is his conſequence drawn from the Records. But firſt, his Conſequence appears not only fallacious, but falſe in Fact, in his reſtraining the Order of Friends only to the Womens Meetings, which is not conſequent to the Record of the Quarterly Meeting, dated, the firſt of the 10th Moneth, 1675. and cited by *F. B.* (p. 61.) for Proof; for the extent of that

that Record is, *For the conſent of Friends at two Mens Meetings and two Womens Meetings, &c.*

2*dly*, Neither can his Account be true, if there was not then a Womans Meeting eſtabliſhed in that part of the County, but that the complaint of the Monethly Meeting was, *That the Perſon concerned did not publiſh his Intention above once to the Mens Meeting, and refuſed to bring the Woman to any Meeting at all, before the time of their Marriage.*

3*dly*, Since the ſaid Exception was writ, I have met with a Certificate under the Hands of ſeveral Perſons of Credit, *i. e. Phillip Taylor, William Braſier, John Prime,* and *Jacob Baker*, who do confirm the matter excepted againſt *Francis Fugg*'s ſaid Account; whereby they declare it to be his 'falſe Inſinuation, and a manifeſt miſrepre-'ſenting of Friends in thoſe parts, and a 'malicious Falſhood. For they affirm, That 'there was *no Womens Meetings* eſtabliſhed in 'that part of the County where it fell in 'courſe for the ſaid Perſon to publiſh his 'Intention of Marriage; and that becauſe 'he refuſed to bring the Woman to any 'Meeting at all (to manifeſt her conſent and intention of Marriage with him) And his 'propoſing it but once to the Mens Meeting,

'and

'and that in her abſence, before he took her 'to Wife. This they looked on as an irregular Proceedure and Innovation, and no ſafe Preſident or Example. For which cauſe, together with his refuſal to give the Monethly Meeting ſatisfaction for the Irregularity (as deſired) on complaint thereof to the Quarterly Meeting, a Record was made, according to their Conſciences and Care, *That they had not Unity with him in this his* SO *doing* (as 'tis cited by *Fr. Bugg* himſelf.

Sixthly, Let it be noted, That *Francis Bugg* is guilty of notorious Falſhood and malicious Slander, where he pretends to diſcover *That hypocritical and two-faced Practice of pleading to the Magiſtrates for Liberty of Conſcience, and at the ſame time uſing and exerciſing all Force, Rule and Dominion they are capable to inflict upon their diſſenting Brethren, who cannot fall down and cry* Hoſanna *to every Likeneſs, &c.* And the Reaſon he ſuggeſts is, *Leſt the Ruling Party ſhould be encouraged to introduce a numberleſs Number of needleſs Ceremonies, till at length* Rome *may, if poſſible, be outdone*, pag. 115, 116. 2d part. Thus like a falſe informing *Judas* he has belched out his Lying Inſmuations

tions, tending to incenſe the Magiſtrate againſt us. For,

1ſt, In the firſt part I take his Charge [*Hypocritical*] to intend our Applications to the Magiſtrates for Liberty from Perſecution: and then 'tis malicious, falſe and ſcandalous, and therein he has acted the part of a baſe Informer againſt us, for which God (who knows our ſincerity and conſiſtency in our pleading to the Magiſtrate on this account) will certainly rebuke his lying malicious Spirit.

In the ſecond part, I take his Charge [*Of uſing all Force, Rule and Dominion, &c. upon diſſenting Brethren for not falling down to every Likeneſs*] to intend that Church-Government, Diſcipline and Order, and thoſe Miniſters concerned therein which he oppoſeth among the People called *Quakers*: And then he hath herein moſt wickedly and falſly informed the Magiſtrates, 1ſt, To render our Applications for Liberty of Conſcience of no credit with them, but Hypocritical: 2dly, To render us guilty of that which we are pleading againſt, *i. e. Exerciſing Force upon our Brethrens Conſciences*, and that *for not falling down to every Likeneſs*. Oh, horrid Abuſe and Slander! And what lamentable Blindneſs and groſs

Abſurdity

Abſurdity is this Adverſary fallen into! like as if he ſhould thus argue, *viz.* You plead to the Magiſtrate for Liberty of Conſcience in the free exerciſe of Religion, from Perſecution, Corporal and Pecuniary Puniſhments on that ſcore. Therefore you are Hypocritical, Two-faced and Inconſiſtent in your Practice, whilſt you exerciſe a Church Authority, by giving true Spiritual Judgment, Admonition or Cenſures upon any that diſſent or divide from you, or cauſe Diviſions or Offences: Such are the Conſequences of his before-cited Charge, conſidering that he has not proved our Judgment *UNJUST*, or Advice and Admonition *ERRONEOUS* or *UNCHRISTIAN* in any of thoſe things oppoſed by him; or our Paper, which he makes his great Proof againſt us, and Scornfully calls, *A Grant and Confirmation by a general Council held at* London, Anno 1675. pag. 41. For which he falſly accuſeth us of *INNOVATIONS*, *IMPOSITIONS*, *APOSTACIES*, *NEW-STAMPED GOVERNMENT*, *ARBITRARY RULE*, *&c.* comparing us to the *POPES COUNCIL.* (pag. 42, 46, &c.) And then he might as well ſay, 'Tis a great infringement of Liberty of Conſcience for a Chriſtian Society to Reprove, Judge or Cenſure diſorderly Walkers

Walkers under the ſame Profeſſion. And by the ſame abſurd way of Arguing and ſhallow Oppoſition he may as well aſſume a Power to ſtop the Mouthes of all Goſpel Miniſters for exerciſing their Conſciences in that divine Authority that Chriſt hath given them, To renounce the hidden things of Diſhoneſty, and to Exhort, Rebuke, Reprove, Admoniſh, Command, &c. according to their Commiſſion, both in the primitive Times and our Day.

Thus we may juſtly conclude, that a corrupt, defiled, immoral Conſcience would have its unchriſtian Liberty.

Seventhly, Some Errors have eſcaped the Preſs, in this Treatiſe, both in Points, Letters and Words, the moſt material whereof are here noted, which I deſire the ingenuous Reader accordingly to Correct; (the ſenſe will ſhew the reſt) wherein I do as I would be done to; for I examine the Errata's, even of my Adverſaries Books, as they are noted, before I anſwer the Matter.

ERRTA.

ERRATA.

PAge 19. Line 4, 6. for *bear* read *bare.* p 26 l 10 r *queſtioned.* p 33 l 24 f *mian* r *main.* p 34 l 17 f *training* r *turning.* p 43 l 13 dele *there.* p 47 l 1 f *the* r *thy* p 59 read *by laws made in the reign of.* p 62 l 3 f *tives* r *tive.* p 84 l 20 f *bear* r *bare.* p 88 l 16 f *juſtifying* r *inſiſting* p 144 l 10 r *blind zealot is.* p 158 l 1 r *in the caſe.* p 167 l 9 f *it* r *in.* p 209 l 2 f *Statutis* r *Statuti.* p 210, l 14 r *their names.* p 228 l 21 r *upon* & P's p 233 l 20, 21 r *abuſeſt, ſcandalizeſt.* p 237 l 3 r *the matter.* p 252 l 16 f *diſingenious* r *diſingenuous.* p 254 l 10 r *horribly.* p 262 l 11 r *Apoſtates.* p 272 l 14 r *rights.* p 279 Margent r *Like the Poſtſcript of* N. C's *Epiſtle.* p 284 l 3 r *are under.* p 295 l 16 r *their Conſcientiouſneſs.* p 300 l 7 f *by* r *thy.* p 310 l 16 r *becauſe thereof.* p 311 l 12 r *and of* p 315 l 14 r *his pretence being, becauſe.* p 326 l 17 f *herein* r *therein.* The ſenſe will evince the reſt of literal fauls, leſs material.

THE END.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by *A. Sowle* at the Crooked-Billet in *Holloway-Lane* in *Shoreditch*, 1682.

DUe Order of Law and Juſtice pleaded, againſt Irregular and Arbitrary Proceedings. By George Whitehead.

The Real *Quaker* a Real *Proteſtant.* By *G.W.*

A legal Examination of Abuſes of Law.

The Religious Aſſemblies of the People called *Quakers* vindicated.

The Chriſtian-Quaker and his divine Teſtimony vindicated; in two parts. By *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead.*

An Anſwer to a fooliſh Libel, called, *The Quakers Opinions.* By *William Penn.*

England's preſent Intereſt diſcovered, with honour to the Prince and ſafety to the People. By *W. P.*

An Epiſtle to the Churches of Jeſus throughout the whole World. By *W. P.*

An Epiſtle to the Children of Light. *W. P.*

An Addreſs to Proteſtants; in two Parts. By *W. P.*

A brief ſtate and examination of Liberty Spiritual. By *W. P.*

An Epiſtle, containing a ſolemn Farewell, *&c.* By *W. P.*

A Mite into the Treaſury: or, A Treatiſe concerning the ſeven Liberal Arts. By *Thomas Lawſon.*

A Teſtimony againſt Tything among Chriſtians. By *R. Richardſon.*

The Foundation of Tythes ſhaken. By *Thomas Elwood.*

Tythes ended by Chriſt. By *W. Gibſon.*

The great Caſe of *Tythes* once more revived. By *Francis Howgill.*

A Treatiſe of Oaths, *&c.*

Univerſal Love. By *W. Smith.*

The Principles of Truth, or a declaration of our Faith, who are called *Quakers.*

An Epiſtle of Love and good Will to the called and choſon of God. By *J. Songhurſt.*

An Invitation of Love to all that hunger and thirſt after Righteouſneſs. By *Iſabel Yeomans.*

A Warning to *London* in particular. By *James Parks.*

A Warning to *England* in general. By *J. P.*

A Teſtimony to the Lords Power and bleſſed appearance in and amongſt Children.

A plain Path-way opened to the ſimple hearted, for the anſwering all Doubts and Objections, &c. By *S. Criſp.*

A Blaſt blown out of the North, ecchoing up towards the South, to meet the Cry of their oppreſſed Brethren.

The Lamentable Cry of the Oppreſſed.

H. Smith's Books collected into one Volumn.

The Spirit of the Martyrs revived.

☞ A faithful Warning, and Lamentation over *England.* By *William Bingley.*